

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 091

OD 019 792

AUTHOR Amarel, Marianne: And Others
 TITLE Reform, Response and Renegotiation: Transitions in a School Change Project.
 SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. Education and Research Div.
 PUB DATE 79
 NOTE 37p.: Report prepared by the Evaluation Collective
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Innovation: Elementary Education; Open Education: Parent School Relationship; *Staff Improvement; Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Outside participation in two elementary schools in a city undergoing ethnic change is analyzed. This outside group, known as the Facilitation Team, worked with teachers and parents to develop a more open and effective school. The experiences of the Team are described and the following conclusions are reported: (1) social forces tended to overwhelm efforts at innovation; (2) factions and interest groups influenced both the process and effect of innovation; (3) the work structure of the school and profession constrained teacher behavior; (4) the voluntaristic approach of the Team was ineffective against the traditional work structure; (5) it is difficult for innovation to succeed without active support at school and district levels; (6) most change occurred in the Team's ideas of how innovations are best introduced. (Author/WP)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED181091

REFORM, RESPONSE AND RENEGOTIATION

Transitions in a School Change Project

The Evaluation Collective

Marianne Amarel
Ernest House
Daniel Langmeyer
Dan Lortie
Rochelle Mayer
Leslie McLean
Leonard Sealey

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolee Iltis

The Ford Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was supported by the Education and Research Division of the Ford Foundation, but the views expressed are not necessarily those of the Foundation.

UD019792

The Evaluation Collective is a group of seven educational specialists with a wide range of competencies and experience. Six have positions at universities or research centers and one is an independent consultant. Individually, the members have served as consultants to school systems, foundations and governments in several countries. They join forces to carry out evaluation projects requiring multiple perspectives and a high degree of human judgment, specializing in projects with an educational component.

© THE FORD FOUNDATION, 1979

Contents

Acknowledgements/i

Introduction/ii

Executive Summary/iii

Chapter 1 The Project/1

2 Appleton School/6

3 Appleton Classrooms/11

4 Appleton Structures/17

5 Crosby: A Second Chance/21

6 A Larger Perspective/25

Some Reference Points in the Chronology of The Facilitation Team/27

Acknowledgements

The cooperation and hospitality extended to us over three years by the teachers, parents and administrators of Appleton and Crosby schools made our job not only possible but a pleasure. We had no choice but to disrupt their schedules and ask special favors of them, and the overall response was generous and helpful. School officials made time in their busy schedules to answer our questions. Special thanks are due to the leaders of the Parent Support Group, who were especially generous with their time.

At the Ford Foundation, Marjorie Martus encouraged and supported this ambitious and somewhat unusual evaluation effort, and we are grateful for her confidence.

Most of all, however, we thank the members of the Team, who unfailingly responded to our many requests for reports, interviews and observations. It was their work being evaluated, and their spirit of cooperation was exemplary at all times.

Introduction

This is the story of a school change project. It is written for persons interested in such change, particularly staff development. The project consisted of the work of seven persons over a period of three years (June 1974 to June 1977). Members of that group — the Facilitation Team, or just the Team — have told their story in a book-length report, *From the Roots Up — A Three-Faceted Approach to School Development*, that is in manuscript as we write this account. The two are separate efforts with different purposes. *From the Roots Up* is a manual for persons trying to change schools; this report is an evaluation of the project. The two reports use the same fictitious names for the schools involved in the project; in this account, we use other fictitious names for teachers, etc. and identify members of the Facilitation Team by their real names.

The purpose of this report is to present the views of some outside observers on the course of the project and to provide interpretations and judgments based on the several perspectives found within the Evaluation Collective. The evaluation matched the three-year length of the project but was scheduled to begin a year after it began and to continue for a year after it ended. The last evaluation visit to the project sites took place in February, 1978.¹

As part of the project, the Team committed itself to maintaining detailed records of its activities and also agreed to provide the evaluators with special reports summarizing key events and developments. Thus we, the evaluators, could hold down evaluation costs by "auditing" the reports in the course of two visits each year to The City (as we will refer to it), and supplementing such information with observations, interviews and self-administered questionnaires.

Our group consisted of seven persons who stayed throughout the term of the evaluation and the writing of this report. This report, therefore, is based on the combined insights of persons who have all had regular, but intermittent, contact with the project over a period of three years. Although we had a general plan for the evaluation, we found it was necessary and desirable to adapt our procedures to changes which took place in the project itself.

The report begins with a description of the project and moves on to the major site — Appleton School. We focus heavily on Appleton, both in description and interpretation, because the Facilitation Team spent the greatest pro-

portion of its time and energies there. They undertook a shorter intervention at Crosby School near the end of their project, working part-time for four months. Since the Team attaches considerable importance to their work at this second site, we have included a shorter chapter directed to events there and to our view of them. The final chapter is an effort to place what was learned by the evaluation group in a larger intellectual context.

¹ A chronology of the Team's activities is provided as Appendix A.

Executive Summary

Appleton is an old elementary school in The City but one located in a revitalized part of town. It draws from a mixed catchment area. Along the lake are highrises where upper-middle class professionals live. Inland is a substantial minority population of Latinos. The school itself has a tradition of high academic performance, though inner city problems have taken their toll.

The principal's style might be described as *laissez-faire*, listening to everyone and not exerting strong leadership. He sees his job as responding to demands, and he's been there more than twenty-five years. Partly as a result, the parents are extraordinarily influential within the school. Parent groups, mostly middle-class parents, provide resources and recommendations for school activities. This picture of relatively smooth functioning (for a city school) was reinforced in May, 1977, when a local television station featured the school on its evening news as "A School That Works."

Television news would have carried a different story in the spring of 1973. Some members of a newly-formed Community Council had mounted a campaign to replace the principal. In their opinion the school was incompetently managed and insufficiently responsive to segments of the community. A season of protracted dissension followed. Partially in response, some parents invited three people to the school, outsiders to the system, who were working with teachers in another school. These people were interested in working with faculty to develop a more open and effective school. A proposal was written, and on the condition that all concerned parties agreed to support the project, the outsiders were promised sufficient funds by the Ford Foundation to expand their "team" and permit it to work in the school for three years.

In 1974, an agreement was reached among school personnel, the Team, the Foundation, the community and the school district. Bringing in the Team to improve the school environment quieted the dissidents in the community and boosted the morale of the teachers. Although the teachers willingly agreed to cooperate with the Team, the agreement was vague, and in retrospect it appears the teachers had little understanding of the plans the Team had for working with them.

The Team, now seven (including one member paid by the District and one by a state-funded research institute),

began with a broad plan for reforming the school. They believed they would develop an approach to working with the school that would not only be successful at Appleton and in its community but would spread throughout the school district and to other school districts as well. The plan included active work outside Appleton as the approach took hold.

In content, the Team's conception of education and social change was that people would be freed up and would grow and develop if institutional and organizational obstacles were removed. Within the classroom this philosophy was manifested in an open approach to education. Within the school as a whole, it was manifested in organizational development that envisioned the creation of self-governing mechanisms involving teachers and parents.

The Team's approach was developed in a period when open education was a subject of considerable discussion, but by the time they started to work, much of the interest had faded. Their plan called for working simultaneously at the classroom, school and school district levels, in conjunction with community organization. In practice, such coordination was difficult to achieve. Their plan proved unrealistic. No charismatic Team leader was directive in implementing the plan. Team ideology helped to bind the members together as a group but was not instrumental in instructing them how to proceed.

Team members refined their roles as the project went on, some working in art, some in science, some at the school level. At the beginning the Team was more expansive and expressive in its enunciation of goals. Gradually, it became more technocratic, more means-end oriented, more careful in pronouncements. This shift may have been hastened by early evaluation reports, but mostly the Team was chastened by unanticipated difficulties in working with the principal and with the teachers.

Originally the Team members made themselves available as advisors to whom teachers could come for help in moving toward an open education approach. When few teachers came, the Team members reassessed their approach and actively contacted teachers. They made progress with a few teachers but not many. Eventually Team members assumed the role of resource people who would go into classrooms to help teachers with anything the teacher wanted, from building furniture to teaching units of math, science or art.

Generally, the Team overestimated their powers of persuasion. Although originally receptive, most teachers did not see the Team members as offering credible alternatives to what they were doing. As helpers in concrete tasks, Team members were more warmly received. The success of the Team varied greatly from one teacher to another. The Team enabled some individuals to change, but not the whole institution.

For institutional changes they relied on the Teacher Planning Room (set up by the Team with resources, coffee and a full-time resource person), the Teacher Planning Committee (whose purpose was initially to negotiate implementation of the Team's plan) and the Parent Support Group (successor to P.T.A. and School Council). On the Team were a full-time organization development specialist and a bilingual community coordinator. Parent and community organization, not dependent on school system support, was highly successful. Organization development with the system foundered repeatedly in a leadership vacuum centering on the principal and extending to the district superintendent. The Teacher Planning Committee (TPC) and Parent Support Group appear to have taken root.

Team efforts were constantly swamped by larger crises originating outside the school. Originally, the Team had been invited into the school because of community dissension. On arrival they were confronted with an intense controversy over bilingual education. Without warning or consultation, new bilingual teachers were assigned to work in mixed classes as team-mates with monolingual teachers. The regular teachers strenuously objected to the arrangement, and the Team took their side, endearing themselves to the regular faculty who credited the Team with salvaging an impossible situation. The bilingual teachers were assigned classes of predominantly Spanish-speaking children while the Anglo children remained with the regular teachers. The school ran smoothly for a time, and then, as if abhorring calm, the district decided to reduce the school's special education program.

Toward the end of the Team's three-year period, the school system was ordered to desegregate its faculty. Concerns about who would be assigned to different schools gripped the teachers. Eventually, several were reassigned and Black teachers were brought into the school. Thus was formed a new separate group who kept themselves apart from the veterans and from the bilingual teachers. A "continuous progress" achievement accounting scheme mandated by the school board eroded Team results after its departure.

The Team attributed some of its lack of success to the original negotiation with the teachers at Appleton. Some teachers, for example, remembered "open education" being defined by the Team leader as "whatever you want it to mean." Several teachers stated they wanted no part of open education as actually defined by the Team. Their seeming acquiescence was based on a misunderstanding.

In line with their original plan, the Team also worked in a different school, Crosby, at the end of their three-year

term. Because of their experience at Appleton, they negotiated a very specific definition of what they would do, as well as a commitment of resources from the district and an equally specific agreement about what the teachers would do.

In the opinions of both Team and teachers, there were many successes at Crosby. The Team scaled down their aspirations for teacher change dramatically. The Team emphasized specific classroom activities that could be incorporated within the teachers' traditional framework.

The Crosby teachers expressed high satisfaction with the sixteen-week intervention period. Although no teacher implemented an open approach to education, the teachers incorporated many specific activities into their traditional classrooms. These activities varied from ways of conducting a discussion to help with non-readers to using classroom space in different ways.

The needs assessment and contract negotiation strategy employed by the Team increased teacher "ownership" of the project and simultaneously militated against radical departures from the status quo. Teacher involvement was more widespread but less intense. No teacher at Crosby said the Team had been a "lifesaver."

One year after the intervention, the Crosby teachers remained very positive about the Team's work there. Relationships among teachers had improved. The intermediate teachers had started an English committee as a result of the Team workshops. The school had improved relationships with the district and had acquired more resources. Many of the activities initiated the previous year were still being implemented, including a Friday "mini-course" that evolved from discussions with eighth-graders.

On the negative side, the teachers perceived no change in parental involvement in their classrooms. Nor, when asked, were they sorry the Team was no longer in the school. While widely praised as a positive influence, the Team's intervention evidently created pressures on the teachers. As one teacher said, "They made a significant contribution, but I'm relieved they're not here this year." Nine other teachers nodded their heads in agreement.

At both Appleton and Crosby, the presence of the Team had symbolic political value. Appleton invited the Team in order to cool a militant community, which wanted to oust the principal. Crosby invited the Team to bolster its image as a place where new things were happening. The Team symbolically and successfully served both purposes.

It was dubious whether the faculty in either school was committed to change in advance. Somewhat more experienced, the Team did take the precaution of securing the Crosby principal and district superintendent as advocates of change, and to make more explicit what they expected of the teachers.

As the project as a whole progressed, the Team became less idealistic and more pragmatic. Somewhere within the external constraints of reality, as manifested in the implacability of schools toward change, and the internal constraints of the Team's own limitations, they did find a niche in which they felt they could operate successfully. As

so often happens, it was considerably more modest than in the original aspirations. Sometimes they even facilitated change in unwanted directions. At Appleton, for example, some influential teachers on the TPC were full of praise for Team assistance to the TPC as they struggled with the bilingual episode and in organizing the "walking reading" program, a program in many ways antithetical to the expressed goals of the Team.

Some change did occur in the direction the Team advocated. The comparatively small number of teachers who worked intensively with the Team incorporated many of their ideas in the less traditional parts of the curriculum. Reading and mathematics instruction were hardly influenced at all. The successful changes were initiated through Team members working on highly specific and concrete projects within the teacher's classroom, such as art activities and the arrangement and appearance of physical space. These led to broader curriculum involvement and more thoughtful use by teachers of Team suggestions.

Throughout the Team's effort, Appleton parents were involved in the school's affairs. This involvement was organized through the Parent Support Group, Anglo middle-class mothers who had strong influence within the school. Latino mothers were also organized by the Team's parent-community worker, but with their strong tradition of non-interference in school matters, they never attempted the sort of influence Anglos sought and attained. They did intervene once via the Bilingual Council concerning needed improvements in English instruction.

As parents saw it, they had gained influence primarily because of the extremely laissez-faire leadership style of the principal. Having gained a position of influence in the school, they were eager to maintain it. The parents helped secure more resources for the school and they provided the bulk of volunteer help. Some parents used their influence to get their own children into the classes of their choice, that is, with the experienced, regular teachers. The Latino children and some Anglos ended up in lower-ability groups. Parents involvement thus had the character of interest-group politics as well as of reform and service to the school.

Both the Team members, who worked closely with the parents, and the parents themselves saw parent involvement as crucial to teacher change. With the Team leaving, the parent group searched actively for other ways to continue staff development. The teachers saw the parents as helpful and supportive but not as critical to the teachers' development.

The most visible and often-cited changes in Appleton were the brilliantly-colored hallway graphics, which transformed the drab, fifty-year-old building into something a little more livable. The work was done by parents with the support and encouragement of the Team, and from this the parent group acquired an increased sense of efficacy. Without doubt, internal communication in the school was improved by Team efforts such as the Teacher Planning Committee, which assumed an active leadership

role within the school during the Team's tenure.

Classrooms did not change substantially. There were a few exceptions, but once inside his or her class, life for many students remained the same when the Team left as when they came, in spite of improved internal communication and the work of seven Team members for three years. The work on institutional structures went on in parallel with the classroom advisory and in the main did not have direct effects on classrooms.

Although little overt teacher change occurred at Appleton, teachers praised the Team highly. Teachers saw their own efforts as greatly facilitated by the Team and were sorry to see them leave. The entry of the Team had had symbolic, political value to the schools and the districts. The presence of the Team was a symbol that the schools were progressing and was a defense against external pressures. Team members were likeable and helping people whose stature grew measurably over the three years.

During the Team's period of operation, many of the forces that strongly influenced the school originated outside, at the district or Board level, or beyond. The Team's inability to change the school from inside challenged their initial beliefs, a process probably accentuated by the evaluation.

The school made good use of the Team as a buffer against disruptive outside forces. In some ways, the Team acted more as a conservator of the school order than as a change agent. Overall, though both changed, the Team changed more than the school.

The Project

By any standard, the resources made available to Appleton were impressive, and with three years to run it was hoped that there would be time for them to have an impact. Lessons had been learned, preparations made. The project was officially launched in July 1974 but the events and forces that brought the participants together had been at work for some time. And the genesis of the Appleton effort, while unique in some respects, reflected many of the issues that occupy funders and implementers of school change.

Starting the project was contingent on the successful conclusion of an agreement among three groups: the Facilitation Team, the Appleton School community and The Ford Foundation. Administrators of the larger school system were also involved, although more peripherally, in its planning and realization.

The activities of these groups during the year prior to the start of the project provide part of the context for the events described and interpreted in this report. The school-community context will be delineated in Chapter II.

The Team — Early Beginnings

The three core Team members, Daniel Scheinfeld, Clive Hazell and Ron Cichon, were at work in four classrooms in two City schools as teacher advisors. Under a USOE grant, channeled through the Institute where Scheinfeld was a research associate, they were exploring on-site training processes intended to help teachers develop a more open approach in their instructional practice. None of them had been certified and employed as classroom teachers. Scheinfeld, who was completing a Ph.D. in Anthropology, had become interested in education while working in a low income neighborhood on a study of the family environments of low and high achieving students. Clive Hazell held an M.A. in Geography and Ron Cichon an M.A. in Clinical Psychology. During the USOE project the three advisors developed, and to a degree, consolidated a set of ideas about experiential learning, about the role of art in learning, and about the concept of dialogue in the instructional relationship.

In the spring of 1973, as this project was drawing to a close, the group was alert for opportunities to put what they had learned into practice in a larger setting, preferably in a whole school. At the same time, they were beginning

to work on an extensive report of their experiences, formulating interpretations, hypotheses and plans of action about school-based teacher development. An emphasis on self-reflection was already evident. They were interested not only in working with teachers, but also in observing themselves at work and in treating their own processes as objects of inquiry.

The Team and the Appleton School Community

During this same period, the Appleton School community was experiencing a difficult and protracted time of hostile pressure on the school. The principal of the school was the primary target of dissatisfaction. He was perceived as an obstacle to improving the school and to making it more responsive to the diversified community it was serving.

A newly formed Community Council spearheaded the effort to improve the school. One of its members circulated a videotape about open classrooms which included a vignette of a classroom where Scheinfeld and his colleagues were working. Subsequently, the three of them were invited to give a workshop for Appleton School staff during an in-service afternoon. Several teachers became interested and one of them maintained contact with the Team. A second meeting with a few teachers resulted in a proposal by the Team describing a plan of work with the Appleton teachers, parents and administrators. A negotiation began, during which this plan underwent several revisions. From the beginning, the proposal included a significant effort to record, to reflect on, and (implicitly) to generalize from the work in Appleton to other schools. Later that school year, the proposal was endorsed by almost all the Appleton faculty, administrators and some district staff.

The Ford Foundation

During the preceding decade The Public Education Division of The Ford Foundation had made several grants to explore new options for staff development, particularly with classroom teachers. These grants were in response to widespread dissatisfaction with the traditional modes of continuing education. They sought to develop school-based alternatives for in-service teaching. The grants also reflected a disenchantment with traditional educational research, the results of which were not proving directly applicable to the improvement of public schooling. Beginning in the 50's, "action

research" gained some renewed credence. It proceeded from the assumption that the educational system would benefit more from the cumulative experience of direct, field-based attempts to change schools than from analytic studies of the educational process. Action research fell into disrepute in the 60's as it, too, failed to yield results that led to improved education. In the 70's, many returned to its basic assumption, with new methods and more respect for the challenge of changing schools.

The Appleton project was designed in the spirit of action research. It had an intervention component and a research component. The Team was ready to work in an urban school with a high proportion of low-income students — a priority area for governments and foundations. The project was not undertaken lightly, since by mid-1970 the difficulty of the task was more apparent, and the resources required to bring about non-trivial changes could be more realistically estimated. Both Foundation officials and the Team understood the school as a social institution of great complexity, one that had in the past often been at the center of conflicting forces in society. There was also fresh awareness that schools are embedded in larger school systems, which, particularly in urban communities, are highly bureaucratized, with a consequent lack of autonomy. The bureaucratization of school systems has brought with it rules, routines and customs that are highly resistant to change.

Thus, during the year preceding the grant, Foundation staff went to considerable lengths to ensure that the conditions for undertaking the project were favorable. Deliberations and negotiations were guided by working hypotheses held by the Foundation staff about what constituted minimally acceptable conditions for approving the grant. Four criteria were prominent: (a) the qualities of the project staff, (b) the nature of community involvement, (c) the degree of support offered by the school administration, and, perhaps most critical, (d) the interest and commitment of the school staff to the project. The Team exhibited two of the qualities the Foundation was looking for: previous experience in staff development and an interest in recording and analyzing their own activities.

Appleton School appeared to be a good site, since the parent efforts to achieve school improvement gave evidence of organized community pressure for educational change. The involvement of community groups was expected to support the project in several ways: community pressure would help mobilize the resources needed to improve schools; parent participation would provide ongoing support for teachers as they worked to better their practice; community groups would serve as a channel for disseminating the work of the Team; and eventually, in order to guard the future interests of their children, community groups would also ensure that positive changes became institutionalized. During the months prior to approving the grant, five community groups were identified and their consent to participate in the project was obtained.

With the Team and site identified, the School Board was approached for its approval and support. Foundation

staff met with Board and district administrators several times, seeking assurance that key administrators would monitor the progress of the Team and be open to extending promising staff development processes to other parts of the school system.

Once the Board's cooperation was secured, the Foundation made funds available to the Team to visit staff development projects across the country. After three months and eighty sites, the Team returned in the spring to modify the proposal one more time. During the following summer, the Foundation also underwrote the Team to conduct workshops for teachers, an activity which gave Foundation staff the opportunity to gauge the Team's ability to collaborate with school personnel, as well as the chance to assess the interest of the Appleton staff.

These extensive preparations had yet another component. The Foundation took the additional step of appointing a Research Advisory Group to design an evaluation, intending to incorporate an evaluative process from the start, with the consent of all participants. A plan was devised for the evaluation to run concurrently with the project and to extend one year past the Team's grant.

An indirect outcome of the discussions with the Research Advisory Group was a modification of the Foundation's view of the Appleton effort, in light of the Group's assessment of what might reasonably be expected from such an undertaking. The précis presented by the Public Education Division to the Foundation as part of the grant approval process reflected that assessment, and is probably the best expression of the posture of Public Education staff at the time:

The Advisory Group maintained that while no single project can be expected to result in dramatic change, a growing network of people concerned about the development of teaching and managerial skills within the system can change the nature of conversation about values and practices in public education. Part of Public Education's agenda is to provide documentation which would clarify what are reasonable goals and effective ways to achieve them in this very complex arena of school norms and practices.

The Team — Goals

As formulated in the original proposal, the Team's primary goal was "to develop self-sustaining open educational processes throughout an entire public school, to spread these kinds of processes into other schools in the District and to significantly affect the thinking of key school administrators in the school system." Their second goal was to "research the processes involved in bringing about the change . . ."

The Team defined open education as a process in which "individual needs, purposes, and interests of both children and teachers play a prominent role." They believed personal meaning and personal relationships to be crucial. In describing the qualities of the relationship between teachers and children that the Team sought to foster, two specific

goals were elaborated: Partnership in decision making, and partnership in exploring the world and sharing perspectives. Another word for "partnership" was "dialogue". The explication of how this process would benefit teachers captures both the substance and the flavor of the Team's thinking:

The teacher grows in this process through the cognitive/emotional differentiation involved in incorporating the uniqueness of another human being in one's awareness and through the process of bringing to bear many aspects of oneself in grasping the wholeness and uniqueness of another.

The goals relating to the relationship among children were equally far reaching. The Team hoped to have:

... relationships among children move towards greater reciprocity and communication in which children are working together, sharing their information and perspectives, complementing each other's strengths and confirming one another as uniquely valuable individuals.

Finally, the directions the Team set for its own growth were cast in terms similar to those for teachers and children. They included:

To build Team relationships based on processes parallel to those we want to see develop in the school. This will involve:

- (a) maximum use of each other as resources*
- (b) open and honest communication*
- (c) value in diversity*
- (d) personal satisfaction in our jobs, and*
- (e) decision making processes based on dialogue which includes everybody's perspective*

The Team — Conceptions of Change

The Team thus had a unified conception of growth, in that the fundamental processes were assumed to be the same for children, teachers, and change agents alike, as were the desired directions of growth. One of the guiding precepts of the Team's way of operating, the notion of parallel process, rested on these assumptions.

Another notable feature of the Team's view was the lack of clear differentiation between change and growth, with the implication that change is growth. There was no discussion in the proposal that change might be unproductive or even pernicious, and no consideration of the virtues of stability, nor the recognition that resistance to change may be a functional response. A corollary of this view of change/growth was that the motivation to change was present in people but that it was inhibited under conditions often encountered in school. The human capacity to grow was not so much a potential, but rather an inclination.

Overall, the Team's view of learning was a constructionist one, in that learning was seen as active and purposeful, involving the construction of personal meaning out of the disorder of experience. Within this premise "expressive" processes were emphasized. Particular importance was attached to the role of art in the learning process. Artistic expression was seen as a way children engage aspects of reality that are

meaningful to them. Symbolic representations of reality were expected to lead to a clearer awareness of personal interests and meanings, thereby strengthening intrinsically motivated inquiry.

The salience of expressive processes was congruent with the Team's view of growth as an "unfolding" — a moving from the inside out — in contrast to models that see the learner more as a receptacle, absorbing knowledge and meaning from external sources. The Team stressed the importance of representing and communicating internalized meaning. Such expression was in fact presented as the primary vehicle for the enrichment and extension of meaning and understanding. In line with this view, the removal of obstacles (such as imposed goals and rules) and the provision of supportive structures became a more focal concern than the specification of skill or knowledge that teachers and children would find useful or necessary for developing their capacities.

In order for such change processes to begin and continue, several conditions were necessary, according to the Team, and they saw the achievement of these as a major task of the project. First, change would have to evolve from the goals and needs of *each individual* teacher rather than from an imposed set. Next, change would have to be supported by well-developed classroom structures. Furthermore, it must take place within the whole school not just within a part of it, in order to provide teachers with the supportive structures they needed for growth to become self-sustaining. Teachers were also to develop reciprocal relationships in which they became resources to one another. In the same way, the school administrators would play a facilitating role in this process.

Similarly, a supportive relationship between the school and school district was required, in which the school supplied new ideas to the district and the district provided support to the school. Finally, the Team posited a school responsive to the needs of the community, and the community would in turn support the innovations in the school.

The realization of this ever-widening circle of mutually supportive relationships directed towards congruent goals appears to be predicated on two related assumptions: first, that growth and change would move in the direction of more openness, and second, that an intensified exchange of views would lead to understanding, which in turn would result in the evolution of shared goals among the various constituencies. The possible reality of divergent interests, which might sharpen into conflict as a function of a clearer understanding, was not mentioned.

The Team — Plans of Action

In order to create the conditions that would initiate the change processes, the Team outlined five main strategies. These strategies can also be viewed as five areas where the Team's primary mechanism for facilitating change would be put to work. The mechanism was that of the dialogue, which was congruent with the emphasis on the unique perspective of each individual and the desire to cultivate

awareness of the perspectives of others. It connotes a one-to-one, face-to-face, voluntary interchange in which neither participant dominates.

First, there would be dialogue with and support for the teachers by Team members. This would lead to collaborative dialogue between teachers and Team, and among teachers and administrators. Through this process teachers would become open to themselves and would shift to meeting their own needs and pupil needs. Teachers would be growing, and this growth would be passed on to the pupils and in turn facilitate their growth.

Second, there would be a Teacher Planning Room and an Arts in. Inquiry room in which teachers could communicate and find materials to integrate into the curriculum. This integration would facilitate expressive learning and the integration of the Arts into the curriculum.

Third, there would be a Teacher's Professional Development Center run by teachers for teachers. Teachers would collaborate.

Fourth, there would be a reciprocal relationship with the school system as a whole. There would be meetings and dialogue with people in the system.

Finally, there would be a reciprocal understanding between school and community. The Team would help parents to organize and would bring them together for dialogue with school personnel.

The entire change philosophy of the Team was thus based on the premise that as everyone makes known his or her needs and ideas, they will be understood and accepted by others, leading to cooperation and to the confluence of aims.

The Team — Staffing

Such far-reaching goals called for more than a staff of three. The final proposal identified three additional prospective Team members, plus one to be selected, for a total of seven. Miriam Rosenbusch, a teacher in Appleton School, would be assigned to the Team while continuing to receive her salary from the School Board. Sue Sommers, an artist with experience in working with learning disabled children, joined the Team as art specialist. Susan Schaffer, a university graduate with varied teaching experience, was to become the archivist of the Team, documenting the Team's activities and deliberations as part of the project's research component. A parent-community worker would be added later. Omar Lopez, who had a B.A. in bilingual education and wide experience in the Latino community, completed the Team in the late winter of 1975. That summer, Donna Morris replaced Miriam Rosenbusch as the teacher member of the Team, under the same arrangement with the Board. There were no more changes.

The Team — Operational Goals and Activities

As they prepared to begin work in Appleton, the Team had a detailed exposition of their philosophy but only a rough idea of what they were actually going to do. In mid-1974, they started to put their goals in more operational terms and to specify the activities that would be undertaken in

order to realize these goals. An overall division of responsibilities among Team members was also worked out.

The operational goals were formulated in terms of six goal areas:

I. Work with teachers

Working with individual teachers or teams towards implementing teachers' goals in the classroom.

II. The Arts and Learning

Working with individual teachers or teams towards the integration of the arts into the learning process.

III. The School

Building support systems within the school.

IV. School-Community

Fostering communication and collaboration between school and community.

V. School System

Building support networks in the wider school system.

VI. Team

Developing effective teamwork and dialogical relations with the team.

All Team members were to work in more than one area, and more than one Team member would work in each area. The division of labor was based on the perceived strengths and interests of the individual staff members.

The Team also decided on a horizontal organization for their work. Scheinfeld had been the leader of the previous project, but the Team declared itself a "headless" group. Frequent meetings were planned to ensure that the Team's activities and decision making processes were systematically documented and that the members shared each others' thoughts. The responsibilities and operational goals are best described by some examples for each Team member or subgroup.

Sue Sommers and Clive Hazell were to spend 90% of their time in Area II, dividing the remainder between Areas IV and V. The first two of the fourteen operational goals in the area of the arts and learning are representative of the rest:

To plan and implement activities with teachers in areas of curriculum study where the arts will help facilitate the learning.

Discuss with teachers the value of the artistic process and the intrinsic value of artistic products, apart from their connection with the rest of the curriculum.

For example, grades 3, 4 and 5 are studying American Indians for the rest of the year. Possible artistic impression might include sand paintings, making Katchina dolls, pottery making and the making of musical instruments and Indian clothing.

In the area of school-community relations, Sommers and Hazell were to support artistic expression that reflected the cultural diversity of the community; and to make a contribution to the work with the school system, they were to inform system personnel of their activities in the school and the community.

In her primary role as teacher advisor, Miriam Rosenbusch (and later, Donna Morris) was to split her time between Areas I and II. The operational goals for working with teachers were broadly stated, and included:

Help teachers to rethink the content of the curriculum and their methods of teaching and help them explore options available to them.

Develop a system or a series of systems for evaluating and recording observations of children within a classroom.

Her work in the Area of support systems in the school focused on the creation and use of a Teacher's Planning Room.

The operational goals to be pursued by Cichon reflected his primary interest in organizational issues. His major effort was to be expended in Area III, (65%), with a quarter of his time spent in Area I, and the remainder in Area V. In the Area of support systems in the school, Cichon's activities were subdivided into three aspects, with related activities planned under each:

1. *To work on the development of the school as an organization*
to encourage and assist school staff in building and using channels for communication and sharing.
2. *To work with the principal*
to encourage and assist the principal in assuming an advisory role to teachers
to be of assistance in working out organizational problems (My perspective, experience, knowledge, of where teachers are)
3. *To work on the provisioning of the school with tools, equipment, and materials useful to teachers in the development of curriculum materials and classroom structures*

In his area of lesser responsibility, working with teachers, Cichon was to emphasize organizational issues as well, for example:

To encourage and support teachers in their experimentation with new classroom structure and process, and in their attempts to deal with problems they encounter in the school/classroom environment.

Although allotting only 5% of his time to work with the school system, his operational goals were ambitious. To list only two:

1. *To do workshops in District and Area teacher's centers and in the schools.*
2. *To encourage the assignment of regular Board personnel to be trained by the Facilitation Team in staff development and school change approaches developed during the course of the project.*

The only member of the Team who planned to be active in all areas was Scheinfeld. Most of his time was to be de-

voted to Area I, working with the teachers.

His goals ranged widely:

To be of use to teachers in ways which help them to make the learning process more meaningful and satisfying for themselves and for the children.

To be of use to teachers in helping them to reflect and utilize their creative powers.

To be of use to teachers in helping them to observe children and to respond creatively to what they observe by provision of structures, materials and through communication with children.

To be of use to teachers in their attempts to help children focus, reflect, create and learn more.

In the area of integrating the arts and learning Scheinfeld was to work with the upper grade teachers for 10% of his time.

His goals for the support system in the school were the same as Cichon's, only with a lessened emphasis. The areas of the school system and school-community relations were to receive a fifth of his efforts, to consist of activities such as visits to administrators, workshops in other schools and consciousness raising in the community.

All Team members were of course to be involved in Area VI, the functioning of the Team itself.

Summary

The Team entered Appleton after protracted negotiations with school and district staff, community groups and the Ford Foundation. The Team's entry had been supported by various factions for various reasons. In fact, some of the groups welcoming the Team were at the same time pressing for programs that proved contrary to the Team's objectives and style.

The Team began work with an elaborated pedagogical philosophy that was marked by a particular approach to interpersonal relations. The concept of dialogue exemplified this approach and was the principal mechanism for initiating changes toward the Team's primary goal, a more open approach to instruction. In the movement from a philosophy to operational goals, activities were specified only in general terms.

Appleton School

2

The Appleton Context

Appleton School is an old elementary school located in a revitalized part of The City. Its five-story brick building, a bit crumbly now, stands on a major traffic artery. Around the asphalt playground is a four-foot chain-link fence. The neighborhood has seen both better and worse times.

Thirty years ago the neighborhood consisted largely of middle-class Jewish families in which competition was keen to send their children to the finest colleges. Community support of the school was strong, and the school enjoyed a reputation for being one of the best academic schools in the city. A teacher who had been there then said, "Children had parents who were backing them 100 percent, and this was a marvelous place."

In the sixties the character of the neighborhood changed dramatically. Families began moving to the suburbs in great numbers. Other families sent their children to private schools. The area became more transient. New ethnic groups — Hungarians, native Americans, southern whites — moved into the area for a while, only to move on later to other parts of the city. These groups lived west of the main business street, while the established families lived east along the waterfront. In school the classes were similarly grouped, so that one teacher would have the West-side children, another the East-side children. Over time the groups that stayed in the area were Spanish-speaking, so that by the mid-seventies Appleton School was twenty-five percent Latino, ten percent Oriental, and sixty-five percent other (mostly Anglo).

Meanwhile the business area, once dominated by family enterprises, was transformed. Along the main street sprouted boutiques, restaurants, cabarets and specialty shops. The district became an "in" place. At night, streams of people flowed from place to place, window-shopping and bar-hopping. During the day, crowds scurried to shops and restaurants, more business-like.

Young families and singles moved into the brownstone apartments along the side streets, always lined with parked cars. The business strip became a meeting place and living area for gays. Once a year they held their own parade down the main street. Standing on floats, the gays waved to the applause of the crowd. At times, the Appleton area glittered in liberality and affluence.

The parents of the children who went to Appleton

School must have felt like a forgotten minority. Property owners became concerned about the intrusion of the new businesses on "their" community. Thus, by the early 70's the catchment area of the school had become quite mixed socioeconomically. Along the waterfront were the high-rises where the remaining upper-middle class professional and business families lived. Austerely modern, these buildings were strung tightly along the shoreline like worry beads.

Behind these highrises were smaller highrises stretching inland a few blocks to the main business street, the rough boundary between the "East side" and the "West side" of the district. Five blocks beyond the main street one found brownstones, and after them another, shabbier business avenue. Past this, the low income Spanish-speaking neighborhood sprawled. All these neighborhoods lay within a half-mile of the shoreline, and all were within the catchment area of Appleton School.

The school itself sat on the main street in the center of the business district, its bricks and turn-of-the-century architecture majestic, if a bit archaic, among the one- or two-story specialty shops. Originally designed for 1200 students, the school held half that number in 1973. And, of course, the students reflected the troubles that seem inevitably to plague changing urban areas. Although still keen on the school as a place to teach, a master teacher who had seen all these changes reflected, "And if somebody else would take over the job of straightening out the lives of the children, then we could do the teaching of the children."

The school was a bit grim. Once through the mailed fence, one entered a double-door, the only door left unlocked during school hours. The door led onto a landing — up one flight of stairs to the main level (and the office), down to classrooms in the basement. The entry hallways were wide and high-ceilinged, but dark because no windows opened into them. The rooms showed their age.

At this time, Appleton had about thirty teachers. As a result of a district-wide bilingual program, the faculty consisted of Anglo and Latino teachers. There were few Black students in the school. The different teachers' groups kept to themselves.

The principal of Appleton had been the principal of the school for more than a quarter of a century and had

seen the school and the neighborhood undergo many changes. His leadership style might best be described as *laissez-faire*. He said he believed that everyone should be involved in making school decisions and was reluctant to take strong action or even to express a strong opinion for fear it might stifle other people. On occasion, however, he was capable of acting unilaterally.

The teachers had conflicting and often ambivalent attitudes about the principal. One teacher said, "He came in (my classroom) three times in the eight years I have been here. He didn't care what I was doing and after eight years of that, it gets to you. I wanted so bad for someone to care about what I was doing . . ." Another teacher said, "I think Mr. Reed is a pretty progressive person. The last school I was at, the guy was a tyrant, actually a tyrant."

Perhaps the dominant teacher attitude was expressed by the teacher who said, "I would rather work for Mr. Reed than a lot of principals, generally speaking." The principal himself said, "My philosophy was to be as permissive as possible with teachers." The discipline and most of the tougher problems were handled by the assistant-principal.

The parents, especially the middle-class parents who joined the Parent Support Group, saw the principal as being very responsive to parental pressure. According to some parents, the formation and endurance of a strong parents' group was the result of the principal's leadership style. Teachers themselves often worked through the parents in order to influence the principal. As the principal himself said, "and, as I mentioned to some parents just the other day who wanted something in regards to their own children in kindergarten . . . They did sort of indicate that maybe they were asking for their own children . . . I told them that's perfectly all right because I try to do everything for everybody."

About 1972, a community coalition had formed to oust the principal from Appleton School. The dissidents charged that a well-off group of intellectuals was dominating the school and that the poor students, particularly the Latino students, were being neglected. For more than two years, the school and the community were in turmoil over the issue. Teachers, parents, and the community became polarized.

As noted in Chapter I, the three original members of the Facilitation team were just completing a project with a few teachers in two schools in another part of the city and were looking for a chance to try out their ideas in a whole school. Initial contact with Appleton was made with parents who were looking for something to lift sagging Appleton morale in the face of continued strife. The parents thought that community conflict might be abated if some highly visible outsiders came in to work for improvements in the school. In March 1973, an invitation was arranged for the three to conduct a workshop for the Appleton faculty. The "introduction" was well enough received that a proposal for continued work was drafted and the three entered into negotiations with the school faculty, the school district, and the Ford Foundation.

The Team members presented their ideas, mostly ideas

about "open education," and asked if the teachers would like to implement them. All but one signed the proposal. In spring 1974 the Ford Foundation provided support for the Team to plan a project in the school. In February 1975 a grant was awarded for a two-and-one-half year period.

The Team looked forward to September 1974 with eager anticipation. They had negotiated their agreement and obtained financial support. The core Team members had visited similar projects in all parts of the country. New members had been recruited who shared their mission, "to develop self-sustaining open educational processes throughout an entire public school." Their primary vehicle was to be staff development.

They collided with major changes in faculty and in teaching methods initiated outside the school (by the school board) but implemented by the Principal without consultation or advance notice to his faculty. This was the first of several such events during the Team's tenure at Appleton, and their work can be seen against a backdrop of powerful forces over which neither the Team nor the teachers had control. These successive changes included the following:

The Bilingual Program Crisis

One of the reforms desired by the dissident group in the community council was a restructuring of teacher assignments. Their objective was "to break up the East side/West side mentality of teachers." The method they suggested was team teaching — one Spanish-speaking or bilingual teacher (most would be new) with one English-speaking teacher (most of the existing staff). The school had been offering some instruction in Spanish, but the effect had been, according to the protesters, that the middle-class kids got the experienced teachers and the Latinos the raw recruits. The solution was obviously to mix the two.

Such a solution is fraught with social and political problems, of course, and the principal and school resisted for a time. The militants were successful in getting funding for their team-teaching plan, however, just at the time the Team was to begin work. A liberal revolt had been largely instrumental in getting two conflicting "reforms" started at the same time.

The conflict appeared most clearly in the decision by the principal to bring in the team-teaching program over the summer without consultation with his teachers and the Team's avowed intention to work for partnership in decision making. The Team and the Community coalition had many compatible goals, mainly at the ideological level, but the means they proposed conflicted. It seems a reasonable speculation, especially in hindsight, that no amount of negotiation could have persuaded the existing teachers to accept the team-teaching plan.

For whatever reasons, a cadre of Spanish-speaking teachers were recruited, not all bilingual and many inexperienced, paired with existing staff and told to start teaching. The Team's professional development project began in a climate of intense faculty dissent.

Continuous Progress Program

The idea of a "continuous progress" program is that learning goals will be broken down into small, readily-measured objectives, and students' progress in meeting these objectives will be noted regularly — perhaps weekly. Student progress is thus not rigidly tied to a grade level or to the pace of a class but instead can be "continuous". In the Team's second year, the City Board of Education moved to implement such a plan.

In some ways the scheme conflicted with Team goals. Analyzing learning into small, easily measured objectives was antithetical to integration of subject matter, and was difficult to articulate with open education processes. The most visible obstacle was the technology, the method of recording for each child the objectives the child had achieved that week. Any teacher who conscientiously tried to review all relevant goals and determine for each student which had been achieved, and then carefully punched the information on each student's master card, would be occupied at this task much of the time. One experienced upper grade teacher said, "I feel like I've been turned into a hole puncher."

Faculty Integration

During the Team's last year in Appleton, the City Board came to an agreement with the Federal Government on a faculty desegregation plan that avoided an imminent cut-off of federal funds. Implementation was set for September (after the end of the project) but that meant choosing the teachers to be transferred during the Team's last year. With virtually no Blacks on the faculty, Appleton was sure to feel the effects, including uncertainty as to who would have to move.

By general agreement with the teachers' union, seniority was the criterion used, and the younger teachers were chosen for transfer — the ones the Team had found most receptive to their ideas. In the end, only three teachers were involuntarily transferred, but two of these were among those regularly involved with the Team. Six new teachers were assigned to the school.

Change in Intermediate Administration

During the first official visit to Appleton, the evaluation group met Dr. Baker, the administrator to whom the Principal reported. Baker, an ebullient, friendly person, joined the Team and the evaluators after school in a local cafe for a free-wheeling discussion of school change, the project, pressures on The City and the like. He exuded support for the Team and its efforts and worked out with the Team a plan to promote systematic spread of the Team's efforts to several other schools.

Alas, in early 1976, Baker was transferred to another district. His replacement, Dr. Yates, was a study in contrasts. He was formal, guarded, distant — clearly biding his time, making no moves. He was content to let the project continue but was not going to push its expansion. He arranged a meeting at which the Team and Appleton teachers presented their work to principals, teachers and parents from other schools (the 'charette'), but it was

more a way of finding out for himself what the Team was doing and how it was being received than it was a chance to expand to other schools. Thus the Team's goal of spreading their approach in the same geographic area as Appleton did not have the sustained support of crucial administrators.

Demographic Changes

In addition, important changes in community composition continued as the Team tried to integrate work in school with parent and community organization. The Anglo population was stable, but the Latino population first changed character and then declined.

The first shift was a change from middle or lower-class Cuban people to other Spanish-speaking groups who were economically less well off and who were experiencing the instability and family problems often associated with disadvantage. Increased transiency and behavior problems put stresses on parents and teachers, stresses with which the Team, having only one Spanish speaker, was ill-prepared to cope. They did cope, but dealing with such forces absorbed some valuable energy that was expected to be devoted to planned activities.

The Team in Action

The Team held to their plan of action (see Chapter I), which called for:

1. Dialogue with teachers and support for their efforts
2. A teacher's resource center in the school
3. A Teacher's Center in the community
4. Reciprocal relationships with the larger school and community system.

Looking back at their activities, two phases are clear, each roughly a year and a half. The Team describes these phases and refers to the first as the "Primary Learning Stage". The second phase was not named, but it might have been called, "Secondary Learning".

The Primary Learning Stage — June 1974 to March 1976

Two physical "structures" and one organizational structure were central to the Team's effort to begin dialogue in the school. The Teacher's Planning Room (TPR) was set up, provided with tools and materials, and staffed on a full-time basis by a Team member. Coffee and useful teaching aids such as duplicating machines and materials to make audio-visual aids were provided. The school had been ill-equipped in this respect. The second "structure" was an Arts Inquiry Room (AIR) where woodworking tools, inexpensive materials and art supplies were gathered and paid for by Team funds. A Teachers Planning Committee (TPC) was organized to facilitate communication between the Team and the teachers.

The TPR was needed because the Team wanted teachers to come to them, and it was set up as the "carrot". The AIR was central to another Team belief, namely that fostering expressive activity, making learning more personally meaningful and opening learning processes could best be pursued through the integration of the arts into all aspects of learning.

Another Team member worked with a committee containing four principals, the district superintendent, fifteen teachers and fifteen community members, to organize and obtain funding for a Teacher's Center in the community. This effort was successful and the Education Resource Center (ERC) formally opened its doors several blocks away from Appleton in November 1975. It had begun to function the previous summer.

When a parent-community organizer joined the Team in April 1975 he found much to do, with a Parent-Teacher Association (P.T.A.) and a Community Council already functioning (the latter having been the base for attacks on the school in the past). Anglo parents in the community and P.T.A. were encouraged to join forces, and the Parent Support Group was formed. With the support of the Team they gained better access to the school and were able to focus their energies on supportive activities. Latino parents, not already organized like the Anglo, were involved by addressing issues vital to them, such as health. In the words of the Spanish-speaking organizer,

Each group of parents required different kinds of assistance from the school-community facilitator. The middle-income Anglo parents needed to identify goals and create a structure to channel their energies towards achieving these goals. They already had organizations, and they had a sense of organizational management. They also had a clear understanding of the specific connections between schooling and the futures of their children.

The lower-income Latino parents, on the other hand, lacked both an organization and an organizational ability. Furthermore, they lacked an understanding of how schooling affects their children's development and future. Initially we helped them organize around their interest in crafts and their concern about their children's health. Later we extended their involvement to decision-making bodies.

A "Latino Cadre" was identified, a group of mothers who met several times in each other's homes to talk about life and the school. Out of this grew the Latino Mothers Cooperative. Their first project was a crochet workshop offered in the school by a Latino senior citizen. While there working on useful garments, the mothers heard about school issues. They had never felt comfortable coming to the school, but after the workshop sessions they were less willing to cede decisions to the school, and they became more active in the Bilingual Council. At first, the Council passed resolutions calling for changes in school practices, both within the classroom and between school and parents, without any mechanisms to implement the changes. Later, they learned to send a delegation to meet the principal. Thus, some progress towards goals for parents was made during phase one.

Work with teachers proceeded slowly. During the first six months the Team reported working with about fifteen teachers, and the number never got much larger. Since the evaluators visited only twice per year, no independent,

first-hand account can be given of this activity. During phase one the teacher advisors attempted to respond to expressions of teacher interest with ideas and support, but they wanted teachers to work things out themselves, including building furniture for their classrooms and exploring activities related to the arts.

During the summer of 1975 (after one year in Appleton) two Team members, evaluating their own slow progress, decided to again offer workshops to teachers rather than work with them individually. (The Team had first offered workshops without success.) In the fall, they involved 11 teachers in making puppets, batiking, masks, poetry and the like, but still no significant breakthroughs were made. The Team also began to reconsider their decision not to have a leader (the 'headless Team'). The fall of 1975 was a time of reassessment, and the results were apparently depressing since members report the onset of "the great malaise" in the Team. Their uneasiness deepened over the winter but was dissipated by the arrival of outside energy in the form of two consultants. The Team was ready for change and received a new perspective with enthusiasm. They refer to having "dropped their fantasies." The primary learning stage was at an end.

Phase II: April 1976 to June 1977

The consultants advised a simpler approach: Concentrate on alterations to the physical spaces in the classrooms as an entree to interpersonal processes. "Go where the heavy energy for change is," advised the consultants. The Team dropped its stance that teachers should do things themselves, with Team help, and instead began to do things directly for the teachers.

Organization was tightened, with four Team members acting as a teacher advisory of generalists, ready to help in any area of classroom life. In May Scheinfeld wrote to the TPC, expressing concern over lack of progress and asking for help to make the final year more productive. The Team conducted a survey of teacher priorities in an effort to ascertain where their help would be welcome. The Team elected a leader. Tensions dissolved. The great malaise disappeared.

As the Team began to feel some success, and saw the end of the project approaching, another member started to search for other schools in which to work. Through all this, the parent-community organizer was building linkages, striving first to increase quantity and then to improve the quality of participation. His work was largely independent of the others, though he was very much a member of the Team.

During this time, the Team archivist became more of a generalist, taking on administrative duties as well as documentation. With fewer meetings and less focus on Team process, she began organizing for the "change manual" to be written as the Team's final product. All Team members contributed to several drafts during the spring and summer of 1976.

On May 7, 1976, the new district administrator sponsored a "charette", a town hall meeting of the schools under

his jurisdiction. It was presented as an inservice afternoon. Appleton, both staff and Team, was invited to describe its project. The main result proudly presented by staff was the Teacher Planning Committee. The Team told about themselves, their ideas and their approach. They were politely received, and there were several expressions of interest, but none of them were sufficiently promising for the Team to proceed.

Moving Out -- Crosby

Meanwhile, a list of schools deemed "appropriate" for the expansion of the Team's work was prepared. Six different areas of The City were canvassed, with the help of central administration. The approach was a cautious one as a result of the Appleton experience. After negotiations, in which the Team's intentions and actions were carefully set out, they worked at Crosby school one day per week for the final 16 weeks of the project.

Back at Appleton

Activity at Appleton wound down rapidly as the end of the project approached. The TPR had been closed down in preparation for a move to another room, and, as of the last evaluation visit, it had not reopened. The AIR was staffed by an interested parent one or two days a week. The parent could not continue, for personal reasons, and the AIR stayed locked most of the time. The TPC was dormant for a while, but did meet several times the year after the Team departed. Several teachers expressed an interest to keep it going, but uncertainty was unavoidable since a new Principal would be named soon.

Appleton Classrooms

3

A key outcome of the Appleton School Project was to be improvement of the quality of the childrens' learning through individual staff development. It was hoped that the improvement would be school-wide and of sufficient magnitude to constitute a beacon within the school system, and that the professional growth of the teachers and developments in the classroom would endure when the project came to an end. Accordingly, the outside evaluation focused on an assessment of changes in the classrooms and in the thinking and behavior of the teachers. This was determined through classroom observation, interviews with staff, a teacher questionnaire, and the Team's own account of their work.

A group of teachers, representative of the five groups of teachers in the Appleton school (primary, intermediate, upper, special education and bilingual) was observed in November 1975 (the Team's second year in Appleton). These teachers included those with whom the Facilitation Team had worked extensively and others with whom there had been little or no contact. In subsequent visits, the sample was skewed to include a greater proportion of those who the Team considered to be making significant progress. Appleton teachers were observed four times between November 1975 and the Team's departure in June 1977. We also made a site visit in January 1978, six months after the Team had left Appleton.

The Teachers

The teaching staff at Appleton was relatively stable. Many of the teachers had spent most of their teaching lives there. Despite vocal concerns of the dissident community group, most teachers considered themselves to be doing an adequate job of teaching. At the time of the Team's entry into Appleton, the teachers were not overwhelmed with serious problems about their students' achievement, attitudes and behavior.

It should also be noted that the Appleton school was not an ordinary elementary school. Its students ranged from kindergarten through eighth grade, with a departmental program for the upper grades. Appleton also contained a "school within a school" consisting of the Special Education classes. These served the whole district, had their own coordinator and were generally recognized as performing a very different function. The bilingual group also became

separated, and cultural differences (with other events) consolidated this. Thus the staff of Appleton School fell into at least four groups: regular elementary, departmental (upper grades), special education and bilingual. A fifth was added when Black teachers were assigned in September 1977.

The Facilitation Team's Overtures and the Teachers' Response

In the light of subsequent events, it is important to consider the degree to which the teachers understood the intentions of the Facilitation Team. The term "open education" had many connotations both for the teachers and the members of the Facilitation Team. To some teachers it was threatening, conjuring up notions of license, lack of control of what was being learned and fears of lowered standards of attainment. A few embraced it, believing that children could achieve much on their own, given the right stimulation and materials, with a consequent increase in performance and self-regard. Many felt that it challenged their bedrock — a traditional curriculum taught in the accepted manner.

Whatever the teachers thought, it was clear to the evaluators that the Team had open education in mind, even though individual understandings of the term may have differed within the group. The Team aspired to the generation of children's experiential learning, the integration of the arts into the curriculum, and the encouragement of children's "interests, feelings and experience." Few, if any, of these qualities were in evidence at the time.

By the time of the first site visit in November 1975, it was clear that the Team's approach was not working well. Although extensive work had been done with a comparatively small number of teachers, many had shied away from what the Team offered. The assumption made by the Team that most or all teachers were interested in what the Team could contribute to their professional growth did not appear to be valid. The teacher-facilitators, by their own admission, were learning how to play their facilitating role.

By the spring of 1976, the Team had decided to make a radical change in their strategy. Feeling that they were not establishing a "clear sense of partnership" with teachers,

and greatly influenced by the visit of the two consultants in March, they decided to focus on the physical environment of the classroom as a major entree to teacher and classroom change. Workshops were abandoned and the teacher-advisors stepped up their work in the classrooms — developing learning centers and making new furniture, such as a “loft” and reading corners, and became much more responsive to the needs and interests of individual teachers.

This transformation into the second and final stage of the Team’s interaction with the Appleton faculty produced immediate and positive results, in that many teachers who had been resistant to their overtures began seriously to work with them and those formerly committed “doubled their efforts.” The teacher-advisors had engaged in professional interaction with approximately half of the staff; the majority of those with whom they had worked extensively were either in the lower grades or teaching the special education classes.

The Facilitation Team had reported in April 1976 that the teachers had displayed little interest in curriculum workshops and in producing new curriculum materials. Our observations confirmed this. Texts, workbooks and ditto sheets of the conventional kind abounded and were used in entirely conventional ways. Where changes had taken place they were chiefly in the classroom physical environment. In particular, space had been deployed in different ways and there were many and new kinds of “home-made” furniture. The main change in the curriculum was a modest increase in the amount of art and self-expressive activity, some of which related to other subjects, such as social studies and science.

Many of these changes were superficial. The Team acknowledged this but saw these changes as an essential first step. The Team subscribed to the concept of “stages” in teacher development and evolved the notion that it was necessary to work with teachers to develop their capacities and understandings in four interdependent areas of classroom functioning: curriculum, physical space, organization (management), and interpersonal relations, with physical space a common entree.¹

In mid-1976, the Facilitation Team felt that they had become much more successful, that the project had increased its momentum and effectiveness and that important changes had taken place. The Team reported “working relationships of varying intensity” with twenty-two Appleton teachers and said that fifteen of the teachers made use of more than one of the advisors. Also, the Team conducted a survey to find out what teachers thought should be happening in their classrooms. At this point the evaluation methodology changed. Rather than using pre-structured observational grids which related to goals stated in the Team’s proposal, we asked the teachers and

advisors to develop cooperatively a list of things to be observed.

The special visit confirmed the high regard in which the Facilitation Team was held by the cooperating teachers. One stated that she would have left teaching without the Team’s support. There were improvements in the environment for learning, and there was a general increase in the quality of human relationships. Visually, the school building was more attractive, with greater care given to displays of art work. A number of teachers had painted parts of their classrooms, and colorful murals relating to curriculum topics had appeared in certain hallways.

Although classrooms looked different, and relationships had improved, a traditional approach to the teaching of reading and math, which occupied a large portion of the school day, remained entrenched. Team members responded to teachers’ expressed needs and acted as a bountiful resource, but results suggested that the Team had not been concerned with engendering philosophical changes, nor with changing fundamental attitudes.

Although the Team did not hesitate to oppose school policy from time to time, they had not adopted a vigorous stand in curriculum matters. “Continuous progress,” which ran counter to certain of their goals, was formal Board policy and was not opposed. Neither did the Team act against the introduction of the school’s “walking reading” program, which required all primary pupils to be reading at the same time so that individuals could move from one class to another to form instructional groups of approximately equivalent attainment. Walking reading was a teacher decision and hence presented a conflict with other Team goals. The major curriculum innovation developed by the Team in their second phase was the “Stash,” a collection of sixty-five shoe box learning kits relating to mathematics, language arts and science that were available on a loan basis to teachers. During the final year of the project, the teacher-advisors began to pay more attention to the curriculum. The chief product was the “Living Things Curriculum” developed by Scheinfeld in association with an intermediate teacher and her class.

The final observations of the Appleton School while the project was in progress took place in April and May of 1977. Observations again emphasized aspects suggested by the advisors and cooperating teachers, and discussion with the teacher followed each observation.

There was increased enthusiasm for the Team’s presence. Several teachers said that the facilitators would be “sorely missed” when the project ended. Of greater significance was the improved quality of the work. Activities had greater depth and relevance. For example, colorful wall graphics, for which parents (with Team support) had been responsible, helped children start on murals that related to the curriculum. Puppet-making had been tied to writing and producing plays. The Living Things Curriculum was in full bloom in at least two classrooms, exemplifying many of the principles articulated in the Team’s original proposal: children were working cooperatively on topics which integrated mathematics and science with language arts and

¹Three reasons were given why work on space arrangement was valuable, not just an entree; (i) Teachers are receptive and not threatened, (ii) visible alterations symbolize change, and (iii) some changes support desirable new kinds of learning and interpersonal relations.

arts; this learning was experiential, involving a degree of choice and self-direction; and student interest and involvement remained high even though the work extended over several weeks and became increasingly more complex. Other curriculum innovations, such as the drama unit in one class and a language arts project in another, exemplified many of the same qualities.

In addition to these gains, there was further improvement in the quality of teacher-student relationships in the classrooms. Much flimsy triwall furniture had been replaced by durable wooden fixtures.

Despite the obvious gains, other areas remained resistant to change. The great majority of teachers remained committed to their traditional approach to the central core of basic skills. It appeared that the real impact of the Team had been felt in the classroom time that remained after reading and mathematics had been dealt with. For most classes, the morning was given over to academic work, and the afternoon used more flexibly.

As the project neared its end, the Team reported that they considered twelve teachers to have changed to the point where it was likely that any teachers would continue to develop after the project ended. Eight of these were in the regular school, and four were special education teachers. It was further considered that another six teachers had benefitted from the Team, but it was not certain to what degree growth would continue.

A Classification of the Teachers

Over the course of three years in the Appleton School, the teacher-advisors of the Facilitation Team worked with a number of teachers. The original mode of providing curriculum workshops for teachers shifted to a strategy of going directly to teachers and responding to their stated needs.

The teachers responded to the Facilitation Team's overtures in various ways. We can categorize the degree of their involvement and the outcomes by considering five classes of teachers:

- I. Teachers who thought that the Facilitation Team had nothing to offer, did not interact with the teacher-advisors, and, as far as we could determine, made no significant changes in regard to their teaching.
- II. Teachers who considered that the Facilitation Team had something to offer, but only in regard to specific, peripheral matters.
They had minimal interaction with the teacher-advisors, were largely unresponsive, and approached the Team only in relation to finite outcomes, such as making a bookcase.
- III. Teachers who considered that there was some space in their curriculum for the Team's ideas, but only as a supplement to the traditional approach to the basics, which remained untouched. They had intermittent interaction with the teacher-advisors, and used them mainly as a "resource".

Visible changes relating to classroom space and curriculum were made, such as painting the classroom,

using the Stash, or introducing an art project.

- IV. Teachers who incorporated the Team's ideas, but not in relation to the basics.

They had frequent and regular interaction with the teacher-advisors and established working relationships with one or more of them.

The distinction between teachers in category III and category IV is quantitative rather than qualitative. Category IV teachers had more frequent contact with team members and implemented more Team-inspired curriculum projects.

- V. Teachers who embraced the Team's ideas in relation to their whole approach, had working relationships with more than one teacher-advisor in relation to a whole range of professional matters, and made many changes relating to all four aspects of classroom development.

On the various occasions when we observed teachers at work, the number and composition of the sample varied. However, over the three years, we made assessments relating to the teaching of twenty-seven teachers in the Appleton School. Three of the twenty-seven were seen only once (in January 1978) and were not on the staff during the Team's tenure. These three teachers are not considered in the discussion which follows.

Teachers in Category I — No Involvement

Only one teacher in our sample was placed in this category, but we must assume that others — perhaps as many as eleven teachers — in the school could be so placed because they were never selected by the Facilitation Team for observation as representing effects of the Team's intervention.

Teachers in Category II — Minimal Involvement

We placed six teachers in this category. Four were random choices for observation, but two had been nominated for observation by the Facilitation Team.

Membership in this category draws from different sectors of Appleton: Primary Grades (2); Upper Grades (1); Social Adjustment (1); and Bilingual (2). Several of the teachers were struggling with new assignments and this appeared to be an obstacle to consultation with the teacher-advisors rather than an incentive.

Several others were veteran teachers who had firm convictions about their teaching and were not especially receptive to the Team's open education ideas, although all acknowledged being influenced to some extent by the project. Overall, however, few changes had taken place during the three years. These classrooms remained much as before, with teachers directing most learning activities and with little that was based on children's interests or choices.

Mrs. A. was a primary teacher who had taught at Appleton for more than fourteen years when the Facilitation Team began its work there. She was a good example of teachers in this category, who were philosophi-

cally opposed to open education. She felt strongly that her traditional education methods were effective in meeting her academic goals, and that her emphasis on skill learning matched parents' priorities. Mrs. A. relied heavily on whole-class instruction and seatwork. Children who finished assigned worksheets could engage in activities of their own choosing. Mrs. A.'s work with Team members was limited in scope and frequency and contributed mainly to the creation of additional activities for "free play", such as the development of a playhouse and a math center equipped with cuisinaire rods, a balance beam, number games and other manipulatives.

Mrs. A. drew a sharp distinction between the Team's accomplishments outside and inside the classroom. "If you go around looking for open classrooms you won't find them." However, she felt that the project had been responsible for important school-wide changes. She cited parent support, the store (TPR), the Teacher Planning Committee and Sommers' and Hazell's art work in the school as significant achievements. She felt the school had changed "atmosphere-wise" and that working relationships among the teachers and between the teachers and the principal were much improved. She also felt personally grateful for the support she received from Cichon during the first year of the project, when the bilingual crisis was in full bloom.

Teachers in Category III — Some Involvement, Some Effect

Seven teachers were placed in this category. All were nominated for observation by the Team.

This group was helped in many practical ways. Various teacher-advisors built things for the classrooms or came in to give direct teaching help with a new project. The Team members were seen as a very capable extra pair of hands which could help make a difficult task easier. There were few signs of any fundamental changes in teachers' attitudes or their approach to the curriculum in general. While most classrooms were arranged and equipped differently as a result of the Team's work, much that went on within them was unchanged. In no case was any teacher's structured approach to the basic skills radically altered, although some used the Team's ideas and the materials which they provided (e.g., Cuisinaire rods and reading games) as an occasional supplement. The Team's greater impact was in relation to the afternoon curriculum, where there was less anxiety about what the children learned.

The experience of Mrs. B. is fairly representative of others in this category. Mrs. B. is a "learning disabilities" teacher who works with a small number of children for the entire day. Her curriculum focuses on "folder work" in reading and math during the morning (independent work while the teacher works with individual children) and science, social studies, art and special activities (library, swimming, gym, music) in the afternoon. Although Mrs. B. relies heavily on a formal program of sequenced instructional units for teaching basic skills, she uses more than one set of materials. For example, she uses both a linguistic series and a basal series in her reading

program. Consequently, the Team's impact was felt largely in the "afternoon" curriculum. The Team helped organize and supply several learning centers and they added to the curriculum Stash boxes, Cuisinaire rod activities, art and music activities integrated with social studies and science activities (Living Things, Curriculum, Dinosaur mural, city mural, Puerto Rico map and music).

As in other cases, the Team has also had an impact on the physical characteristics of the classroom. The room has been reorganized and painted, and furniture has been added (storage units, cubbies and bookcases, bench-risers, and peg boards). Mrs. B. feels that many good things have come out of the Team's work at Appleton. She said there was more faculty participation, a more cooperative attitude among staff, a willingness to share and to try to solve problems and a real effort to reach out into the community to generate parent involvement. In February 1978 Mrs. B. said that many of the changes brought about by the Ford Team in her class were still intact. The Stash was still being maintained by parents who take requests for loans and distribute the materials. The Parent Support Group was still active and parents were available to help out in the classrooms. Mrs. B. feels the Ford Team did a lot to facilitate communication between teachers and parents.

Mrs. B. feels the Ford Team brought fresh ideas and helped teachers develop their own analysis of what they wanted. They improved the physical appearance of the school and the classrooms. Mrs. B. misses having the extra people around although she also admitted to ambivalent feelings about the extra work. "Sue Sommers worked on a mural with the kids and the kids still walk by and say so-and-so did this and so-and-so did that. Anything you do with kids takes extra effort and some days you just want to be left alone. But if extra resources are available, you also want to have them."

Teachers in Category IV — Regular Involvement Outside the Core

Seven teachers were classified in this category. Five of the group taught grade classes and three were social adjustment teachers.

The teachers in this group represented the whole range of experience. Not all had welcomed the project when it began, and many were strong personalities with very clear ideas about their roles. All were helped by several teacher-advisors in a variety of ways, had established close relationships, and, by the time the project ended, begun to work on several of the development strands. Two of the group were so stimulated and supported by the Team that they relinquished their original intention to quit teaching. Almost all of the teachers in this group felt a deep sense of gratitude for the personal help they had received from the Team. Several admitted to much greater self-confidence as a result, and to important changes in attitudes. The integrity, resourcefulness and personal qualities of the Team members were very highly regarded.

Many of the classrooms of the teachers in this group had interest centers, and there was a much greater degree

of children's choice. Attempts had also been made to integrate elements of the curriculum, particularly with art. Several of the teachers in this group had worked with the teacher-advisors to develop their own curriculum materials, although the major inputs were made by advisors. In many cases, teacher-advisors had scheduled regular teaching periods in the classrooms either to develop and test elements of curriculum, demonstrate another way for the children to learn, or provide help with a new project. Parents were also involved in three of the classrooms, providing various kinds of help — from direct teaching in relation to a special area of expertise to making learning materials.

The one thing that was common to all category IV teachers was their persistence in maintaining almost intact their approach to reading and mathematics instruction. As one teacher explained in a post-project interview, "My attitude toward the class was different. What the children could do all day in the classroom — my concept of that was different. But my teaching itself — the way I taught reading or the way I taught math, was the same." Another teacher, talking of how the morning remained devoted to the traditional approach to the basics, said, "Reading is reading." The afternoon was extremely flexible, with opportunities for many open-ended activities, but it was not considered to be as important. The teacher stated, "I think it's like frosting."

Miss C., an elementary grade teacher, worked mainly with Sommers and Hazell. Like the other elementary grade teachers in this category, the slots in Miss C.'s schedule that are not devoted to reading and math have been greatly influenced by the Team's work. Curriculum projects included an animal unit (mural on zoo, committee work, animal books and games), a mask unit (papier-mache masks, poetry, self-portraits), a drama unit (improvisation and pantomime, puppets and plays, and comic strips) and a science unit using the Stash. The physical space in Miss C.'s classroom has been altered by grouping the desks, and by the addition of cubbies, dividers, and a paint-storage device. The room has also been painted.

Many people have helped in Miss C.'s classroom. One parent led a music period once a week; another served as a "picture lady". Each week the "picture lady" showed the children paintings of a particular artist; the children then drew a picture in the same style as the artist. Another parent graded papers.

Morris took responsibility for two math periods a week, and toward the end of the project, Hazell and Sommers each took responsibility for one period a week related to the drama unit. Miss C. reported that the auxiliary people were a key factor in making life easier. She felt a burden had been lifted and that as a result there was more shared responsibility. Having more people in the room gave her more time to work individually with her students.

Miss C. said that the Facilitation Team had a bigger impact in the school in their second year because the Team members had changed their attitudes. Now they were ready to do what the teachers needed and wanted

instead of what the Team wanted and expected. She viewed their desire for the total involvement of the teachers as a "pipe dream." "It's one thing to work with new teachers, but you can't switch veteran teachers in mid-stream."

Teachers in Category V — Full Involvement as Intended by the Team

We placed three teachers in this category. Two of the teachers were in the school during the whole period of the project, but the third was there only for the last two years. None of the three had a long-established history of teaching in the traditional manner, and all had fundamental interest in child-centered approaches, which the teacher-advisors were able to build upon.

The teachers in this category would be considered very good by any standard. They were innovative, effective, extremely hard-working and had a natural leadership style. They cared a great deal for the children while maintaining an appropriate emotional distance. They were critical of themselves and their teaching — always seeking to do better but aware of limitations. For them, the advent of the Facilitation Team was of great significance, and they were able to use the teacher-advisors to the best possible advantage. The teachers did not consider that their primary concerns had changed as a result of the Team's work, but the availability of the advisors to talk over ideas and provide help with the implementation of those that seemed appropriate was invaluable. The results were outstanding.

Sarah T., an intermediate grade teacher, is one of the success stories. A Team member writes, "Sarah wanted to be involved with the Team and learn to be an open classroom teacher from the beginning . . . Much of what has happened in her room has been because of her own energy, enthusiasm and effort to grow. We on the Team have mainly provided her with resources and some direction (especially in the sense of bouncing ideas off another person), and materials and skills." Sarah herself says that she agreed to take the job of a regular classroom teacher (she had been a bilingual teacher) because the Facilitation Team would be there to help her. The relationship between Sarah and the Team members had been mutually satisfying. She said that the Team in general, and Donna Morris in particular, pushed for growth productively.

Mrs. T.'s list of change items identifies a large variety of curriculum projects undertaken with the help of Team members (dioramas of The City, batik Chinese New Year banners, murals on the waterfront view, unit on plants, electricity kits, and more). The Team is also credited with the introduction of many materials (clay, papier-mache, scrounge art, parent-made Stash kits) and the organization of classroom space. The interest centers, the construction of a loft, cubbies and shelving, tables, stools, rugs and display space have all been added to the classroom over the three years of the project.

The interest centers in Sarah's classroom are centrally located — not additions around the outer rim of the room. The daily schedule has a familiar morning group activity

called "circle time." During circle time the new activities or materials that have been added to the centers are discussed and children sign up for time in the various centers (math, science, social studies and language arts). While the children work in the centers, Mrs. T. works individually with children in reading. She sometimes pulls together a group of children for instruction in a particular reading skill. Mrs. T. has rather elaborate formats for recording children's progress in reading and for keeping track of the work they do in interest centers. Significantly, Mrs. T. does not participate in the school's "walking reading" program. She credits the Facilitation Team with providing moral support for her position and feels that their encouragement was an important factor in enabling her to act on her convictions.

From our observations, the classroom appeared to be a well-functioning work unit. It was well organized to stimulate, direct, and maintain inquiry and individualized activity, thus freeing Mrs. T. to spend time with children in her clinical role. The children seemed to like school and appeared genuinely involved in their activities. Peer interaction was characterized by helpful, productive exchanges. Sarah appeared to be an especially skillful discussion leader. Unlike some teacher-centered classes, the discussion period was an opportunity for students to discuss their concerns. Mrs. T. would build on the students' ideas by asking questions, making suggestions for related activities and facilitating peer communication.

Mrs. T. was a motivated and capable student of Team's ideas. She attended workshops offered by the Facilitation Team members, read materials suggested by them and availed herself of staff development opportunities made available by the project (e.g., visits to SEA in Minneapolis and in a nearby Lab School, ERC Workshops and a workshop in child observation with Pat Carini). Her classroom evolved over the last two years of the project. During the last visit, the classroom was more attractive, less cluttered and better organized. The activities in the centers had changed from those characteristic of a rather traditional curriculum, such as worksheets, to more experiential activities which used manipulatives or involved doing and making things. Parents helped in the room and Sarah's own professional interests were beginning to shift from a focus on materials to a focus on child study (observation of individual children with Scheinfeld).

When interviewed in January 1978 Mrs. T. said that the absence of the Team affected her "tremendously." "There is now nobody available in the school that I could go to right away about anything. The whole atmosphere of the school has changed. There just isn't the unity that there used to be. There are many more divisions and cliques. Individuals keep to themselves. There is no communication."

Enduring Effects of the Intervention

The teachers whose classrooms we observed and to whom we spoke in January 1978 presented a picture that was mixed but not encouraging overall. Two teachers had maintained contact with certain of the teacher-advisors and

continued to solicit their ideas. What other teachers said was more discouraging.

One teacher who had been used to having the high achieving first graders was required to take the "low" group. She dismantled her learning centers, stating that they did not "work" with "these kids." Several of the social adjustment teachers were so embroiled in the turmoil created by the introduction of new staff (as a result of the staff desegregation order) that energies previously devoted to generating new curriculum were no longer available. On the whole, however, changes from the previous year were sustained but no new developments had taken place. The morale of the teaching staff seemed generally to be low.

None of the new (replacement) teachers whom we observed and interviewed had any significant knowledge of the project. One stated, "There has been absolutely no carry-over from any program that may have been here last year at all. If there was anything dramatically different going on, it had gone by the time I arrived in September . . . I knew about the program strictly by accident." Promising developments which would have been in accord with the goals of the Team were the outcome of the new teachers' own ideas. A new curriculum about pets, for example, which had similar characteristics to the Living Things Curriculum, had been developed without any knowledge of it.

The teachers who had been transferred away from Appleton had been placed by us in Category IV. The general approach of all three was traditional, but the circumstances of their new schools dictated this. One expressed strong views about intentions to implement the project ideas as soon as circumstances permitted, and one had introduced into the curriculum some of the creative ideas gained at Appleton.

Given their limited impact, the Team's hope of reaching out into the district could not be realized. The focal intention of establishing more "meaningful" learning by children throughout the school was expected to result in greater enthusiasm for learning, a sense of personal involvement expressive of individual children's interests, thoughts and perceptions, and much more initiative and self-direction. Many of these characteristics were antithetical to the traditional approach to learning and teaching, particularly in regard to basic skills, and the Team did not succeed in breaking through this barrier in more than one or two classrooms. They did make inroads in relation to other subjects, especially art, science and social studies. In the Team's defense, it should be noted that only recently has the conflict between traditional values and new methods been seen as such a formidable barrier.

Appleton Structures

4

The Team began its work at Appleton School with high hopes of changing relationships within the school and developing new connections to other parts of the school system. They hoped that the principal would become more responsive to teachers in general and to teacher experimentation and growth in particular; they also hoped that there would be more sharing among the teachers and that they would move away from the professional isolation found in so many schools. They looked forward to expansion of the changes generated at Appleton and envisaged building bridges to other principals and officials in order to spread new practices and new attitudes. Nor did they want such changes to be purely temporary — they sought to institutionalize them so that “structures” would persist after they left the scene.

As other parts of this report indicate, the aspirations of the Team sprang from a somewhat optimistic view of what could be achieved in a particular setting at a particular time. In this section, we wish to concentrate on their efforts to influence professional interactions and relationships inside and outside Appleton.

The Team's initial efforts did not succeed in mobilizing the interest of a large number of teachers at Appleton; it was not until the third year that any considerable number of teachers turned to them for assistance in their classroom work. Original hopes for change were based on the expectation that many teachers would become involved in attempts to reorganize their teaching, and as the numbers swelled, converts would seek out each other for support and band together to win others to their new views. The implicit view was one of highly enthusiastic participants pressing outward to affect others. Since enthusiasm developed slowly and, in fact, never reached the hoped-for levels, events took quite another course. After some introductory comments on the organizational structure of Appleton School, we will discuss these events from two perspectives — the more formal aspects (particularly the Teacher Planning Committee) and the less formal patterns of interaction among members of the professional staff.

The Authority Structure At Appleton

A comprehensive study of the organizational structure at Appleton would require more data-gathering than our evaluation team, working on an intermittent, restricted

schedule, could muster. Yet the interviews we conducted, the observations done and the report provided us by the Team permit us to at least outline some of the salient features of that structure. In particular, the way Team members viewed and responded to authority had consequences for their actions, in many instances frustrating their work in ways which became apparent over time.

When the Facilitation Team entered Appleton, the signs were auspicious. The district superintendent was highly supportive. The principal had good reason to welcome the Team since their Ford and community support strengthened his position at a time when it was shaky. During the battles of the Sixties, both his school and his performance had become the object of attack. He had become embroiled in a conflict which polarized those involved with Appleton both in the community and within the staff. Members of the Team might well have expected that with such support from the line of authority, they would be buttressed in their efforts to engage teachers in new kinds of activities. It was also true, however, that the Team did not possess a strategy for organizational change that would permit them to generate specific plans and test the readiness of administrators to support them. The Team later realized that the conditions of their work were inadequately specified during negotiations, an omission they rectified when they entered Crosby School. It is important to note that the members of the Team were, from the perspective of the school system, “outsiders”, without any legitimate claim to using system authority in the pursuit of their goals.

It is notoriously difficult to make changes in the interactive patterns of public schools, and this is especially the case where a school is organized into self-contained classrooms in which each teacher works on a set of discrete and essentially independent tasks. Under such circumstances, a teacher's day is spent with children — interaction with adults takes place, when it occurs, on the fringes of the teacher's time and attention. Appleton was, and still is, a “traditional” school in this regard. There are exceptions: teachers in special education reportedly spend some time working together on instructional problems, and the “walking reading” program involves some task sharing. Not all self-contained schools, of course, are identical, and some principals make conscious efforts to foster collegial contact among staff members. From everything we have

learned about the principal's leadership style at Appleton, however, this was not the case. In fact, the operational mode of the principal probably contributed to the professional isolation of teachers at Appleton.

Mr. Reed had been principal of Appleton School for many years when the Team arrived on the scene. He recalled important changes which had taken place during his tenure and in interviews laid heavy emphasis on how the clientele of the school had changed over the years. Appleton had been defined as a good place to teach by those who wanted ambitious youngsters planning to go on to more education, and the pattern of instruction reflected that orientation. In recent years enrolment had declined and the principal welcomed special categories of students (e.g., special education students) and special services such as placements by a local school of social work. The result was, as we have said, a somewhat more complex organization than is usually true of elementary schools. The principal developed an approach in which he delegated considerable responsibility not only to the assistant principal and adjustment counsellor but also to individual teachers. One got the impression that boundaries around some units (e.g., primary versus upper grades) grew strong. The somewhat distant stance of the principal (he rarely visited classes or sought to influence instruction directly) probably contributed to the segmentation of the school. Lacking a strong central direction, the parts tended to separate.

The teachers perceived the principal as remote from their classroom work and uninvolved in their day-to-day teaching. Such a laissez-faire style has both advantages and disadvantages as far as teacher preferences are concerned; many teachers like the autonomy it provides them, while some regret the seeming indifference to their activities. Some individuals are ambivalent, wanting both independence and recognition. Whatever its effects on individual teachers, it influenced the efforts of the Team, for it limited the ways they could affect classroom life. It is true that they were permitted to "peddle their wares" without interference, and that teachers who wished to make changes could do so, at least in the bounds of their own classrooms. But the formal leader of the school did not lend his moral influence to their efforts; he remained aloof from instructional specifics and did not try to influence teachers towards Team objectives. Although his enunciated philosophy of education (a version of Dewey) was somewhat consistent with the expressed aims of the Team, he did not exert any official sanction or even quietly press older, more experienced teachers to consider change in their teaching methods. Team members (and some teachers), found interaction with the principal frustrating and unclear, and during one period Team and principal went their separate ways. It is clear that the Team had little direct influence on the principal. His style of leadership remained the same over the three years during which we observed.

Yet things proved to be more complicated. Although the preceding comments imply a lack of authoritative pressures on school staff, that was surely not the case, particularly

during the last year of the Team's presence and after their departure. Yielding to pressures from his superiors, the principal gradually tightened enforcement of Board policy on continuous progress. Some teachers interviewed in the last round were angry and even bitter about the principal's failure to shield them from such pressures, resenting the intrusion into their teaching tasks. Although he was unwilling to use his authority to support Team efforts, the principal did move to comply with school system directives. This difference underscores the significance of formal authority and the comparative weakness of influences which operate without it, for in the final analysis, the Team was dependent on voluntary responses to their ideas and suggestions. Formal authority could move a *laissez-faire* principal — the Facilitation Team could not.

The Teacher Planning Committee — A Formal Innovation

It is ironic that the Team's most significant structure, the Teacher Planning Committee, was introduced almost casually, initially as a device to enhance communication between the Team and the teachers. It was inaugurated at a time when a school-wide condition, the bilingual crisis, provided an important item for the agenda. Team reports also stress that the opportunity to decide how funds should be expended provided focus for committee action. The initial members of the committee were volunteers who acted as representatives for particular sub-groups in the school, and after some experience, they apparently took this representative function seriously, polling others on their opinions and the like. It is particularly interesting, however, that these leading teachers (the TPC seems to have attracted teachers of higher than average status) were by and large not those who sought classroom assistance from Team members. In fact, some of them expressed distaste for the Team's approach to classroom matters. But Team members should be credited with much of the energy which got the committee going and sustained it through its early trials. Cichon played a particularly important role in helping members of the committee get themselves organized into a continuing and effective body. By its second year of operation, Team members did not have to play such a heavy part, for the group managed its own agenda and affairs without help. The TPC survived the departure of the Team, although it was not highly active at the time of our last visit to Appleton. Those whom we interviewed and those who responded to the self-administered questionnaire, however, showed high awareness of the TPC and generally approved of it. In their responses some linked it to questions about their capacity to influence school affairs, volunteering references to the TPC as having important potential in that regard.

Given the initial orientation of the Team, there were certain contradictions between the activities of the TPC and the Team's advisory work. Some of the decisions made in the TPC, support for the walking reading program, for example, did not accord with the beliefs of Team members. Nor is there indication that the TPC furthered advisory work during the first two years, except perhaps, to confer

some prestige on the Team within the school. As the Team shifted its perspective to a more service-centered, less ideological position, such contradictions became less significant.

As we completed our evaluation field work at Appleton, the future of the TPC rested on several factors which were difficult to assess. One was the problem of new teachers who were completely unfamiliar with its workings and the possibility that those teachers (largely Black), might not become integrated into its affairs. Another question, probably more important, was how the current principal's successor would react to the committee. Would he or she welcome it or seek to undermine it?

The TPC was an important innovation. It facilitated contact between the Team and the faculty and thus served its initial aims. In addition, however, it mobilized considerable faculty energy for an attack on a variety of school problems, adding the perspectives and commitment of faculty to those of the somewhat passive principal. The principal initially implied that he would accept TPC decisions and then apparently wavered on the matter, but in the main he seems to have valued the group since it gave him the opportunity to bring problems to the attention of the faculty. The TPC filled some gaps in the governing structure of the school and came to be respected by parents as well as by faculty. An informal pact was made that parents and teachers would work together to convince a new principal that the Parent Support Group and the Teacher Planning Committee should be maintained.

One of the more interesting aspects of the TPC was the way it complemented union activities. Many of those who were most active in the TPC were also active union members. Yet the TPC avoided welfare issues and kept a broad perspective on school affairs, serving rather as a professional forum in which teachers considered school-wide issues. It thus broadened the base of teacher participation, providing an opportunity for teachers to participate in terms other than self-interest. It is difficult, of course, to make any precise estimate how such involvement developed the professional sensibilities of those engaged with it. It is, however, possible to say that without it the faculty would have had little opportunity to help shape school issues which had direct bearing on the education of students.

Other Structures

Other Team activities were also seen as building structures to facilitate the kinds of changes they sought to achieve. Examples cited were the Teachers Planning Room (TPR), the efforts to assist the formation of a local teacher center (ERC), and the energies devoted to "expanding outward", such as the charette.

The TPR was useful when the Team was in place, serving as a convenient location for meetings, informal conversation, and some advisory work. From what we have learned, however, it never became a vibrant center of professional influence. Nor does it seem to have made a lasting impact on the school.

The situation as far as the ERC is concerned is somewhat cloudy. From reports made by the Team and the testimony of one or two teachers, it appears that the Team had considerable impact on the teacher center. Team members reported that they served leadership functions in its early days and others helped with its program. A financial contribution was made from Team funds. We believe that the persistence and vitality of the Center is due mainly to the efforts of its own staff and a core of energetic Board members, but that the Team played a modest but important part in its creation.

The effort to expand Team activities resulted in the intervention at Crosby School, since earlier efforts to influence the district in which Appleton is located did not produce any lasting arrangements. The charette proved to be a unique occasion that did not result in any interest on the part of other schools in the Appleton experience.

Informal Interactions Within The Faculty

As we mentioned above, the Team hoped that teachers at Appleton would develop closer professional ties and that their efforts would result in more sharing of work interests and more mutual support. They thought that teachers engaged in change would band together for technical exchanges and emotional support. Such alterations in peer relationships would result from interventions with individual teachers, aided by the TPC and the TPR.

It is important to realize what the Team did *not* intend or undertake. There was no explicit plan to reorder work relationships, to realign tasks toward greater interdependence or to introduce other changes associated with such approaches (e.g., differentiated staffing or team teaching). The approach emphasized developing voluntary interactions through advisory work, through workshops, and through suggestions to individual teachers that they confer with other teachers. The original plans did not mention differences among teachers based on ethnicity or race or class, those 'latent identities' which previous research has shown to be important in the interactions of urban teachers. The Team conceptualized and stated its objectives and processes in psychological and professional terms, making no mention of sociological or organizational considerations. It is our conclusion that there were no lasting changes in the interactive patterns of Appleton teachers brought about by the Team. It is clear, however, that while the Facilitation Team was in place teachers saw it as contributing positively to the 'atmosphere' of the school.

Our judgments are based on review of interviews and questionnaire data collected during the first year of the project and then during the year after its formal completion at Appleton. There are no indications that after the Team had left Appleton, teachers engaged in any noticeably greater amount of mutual sharing or work sharing or any other classroom-related interactions. The TPC brought about more discussion and interaction on school-wide matters, but it did not focus on the day-to-day activities of individual classrooms. It is not even evident

from our interviews that the Team sought more teacher-to-teacher connections; respondents do not cite that as an important goal of the Team. During the last interview round we heard some accounts of informal sharing, but it was the usual sort of thing encountered in self-contained schools and did not seem greater than during the first round. (One place where the Team may have reinforced sharing was with the special education unit.) At the completion of the project Appleton remained a school in which most teachers worked alone the majority of the time without any considerable amount of professional discussion or interaction with each other.

The reports that the Team enhanced the 'atmosphere' of the school are not *unimportant* and we believe them to be true. It seems evident that having interested 'partners' available to talk about teaching problems was significant to some of the teachers. The Team had extra curriculum materials available and would back up individual teachers with items especially constructed for their classroom. Team members were eager to listen to individual teachers. The TPC, moreover, served as a safety valve for teacher discontent. Such reported increases in morale are frequently discounted as "mere Hawthorne Effect," but we are not inclined to take that position. Raising the morale of urban teachers, even temporarily, is no small gain.

We are less happy to report, however, that some of these improvements in the tone of the school apparently did not persist after the Team's departure. In our last round of interviews some of the teachers who had worked more closely with the Team were discouraged, while others, some leaders in the school, also expressed discontent bordering on alienation. Various reasons were given and we cannot connect the lowered morale to the Team's departure in any simple way. Teacher transfers, the imposition of the continuous progress program, the uncertainty about the principal's replacement — all contributed to the concerns expressed by those who appeared let down. The faculty at Appleton could not be sure that whatever gains they had made during the project period would survive the pressures and events of a large school system in which their power was severely limited.

Cleavages Based on Non-Professional Identities

Appleton, as already noted, was more segmented than many elementary schools because of its separate units. In addition to this basis for internal differentiation, however, we found that the school was marked by sharp, informal cleavages along ethnic and racial lines.

Although the number of Spanish-speaking teachers was small by the end of the project, they reported that their non-class time was spent largely with others of their background. The same was reported by Anglo teachers. Feelings ran deep in some of the interviews with Latino teachers — feelings of isolation and rejection by their fellow teachers. The new Black teachers, moreover, followed a similar pattern of self-segregation, and it appears that racial cleavage appeared in union affairs at Appleton as it had in schools elsewhere. The school may have been formally

"desegregated", but in terms of informal relationships among faculty members, it was not "integrated". The Team cannot be held responsible for these developments.

Although they helped resolve the dissension over the coerced teaming of Latino and Anglo teachers, in favor of the Anglo teachers, they seem to have made strenuous efforts to include Latino teachers in their subsequent work. They could not anticipate the policy which would bring Black teachers into the school under less than ideal conditions. Yet those interested in such interventions in the future should perhaps have their attention drawn to the severe limits which racial and ethnic identities can impose on efforts to increase professional interactions within a faculty. What strategies and tactics can be developed to help faculties cope with these limits? Would it make a difference if the Facilitation Team had a broader representation of racial and ethnic groups? We do not pretend to have answers to these difficult questions but include them primarily to draw attention to their significance.

Concluding Comments

We cannot be sure how many structural and interactional changes would have taken place in Appleton had more teachers become deeply involved with the Team in the early stages of the project. We cannot, therefore, be certain that the "working theory" of the Facilitation Team was inadequate. Yet we suspect strongly that it was overly optimistic to expect interactive changes as the result of individual changes in teachers and administrators, even when supported by structures such as the TPC.

Their proposal overlooked organizational and sociological factors which appear to have been important at Appleton and may well be important in other settings. It is more probable, for example, that changing interactions among teachers requires changes in the disposition and organization of tasks, that breaking many years of traditional isolation is impossible without structural changes in the work day and its degree of required cooperation. It is, in fact, difficult to overcome that tradition even when space arrangements are changed and teaching teams created. To expect much change when the self-contained classroom remains intact now seems even less likely. Future interventions which aspire to structural and interactive changes should take the Appleton experience as evidence of the need for strategies specifically directed towards those ends.

Crosby: A Second Chance

5

As the third and final year of the Appleton School Project approached, the nature and extent of the Team's effect on the school became visible. During the same time, the Team was reconsidering and refining their earlier conceptions about processes of school change and teacher development. Many of these reformulations related to the conditions necessary for initiating change and the terms for entering into a working relationship with teachers regarding their own growth. Eager to test out their hard-won insights, the Team looked for a place to make a fresh start, a move in line with the expectations set up in their original proposal.

The search included a series of presentations at meetings of principals, district superintendents and other administrators believed to have the leverage to invite the Team into a school. Through these activities, five or six schools were identified as having an interest in working with the Team. In the fall of 1976 the Team conducted a "needs assessment" in each school. The assessment began with a presentation by two or more Team members of the services they were prepared to offer and a description of their way of working. This was followed by a questionnaire to teachers in which they were asked to rate the degree of their interest in the offerings of the Team. Using the result of the needs assessment, combined with additional information about the conditions likely to await them at the five sites, the Team selected Crosby as the school where they would implement their new strategies for facilitating change.

As in Appleton, the wedge that opened the door was parent unrest and dissatisfaction with the way the school was fulfilling the multiple expectations of diverse constituencies. The difference was that the issues at Crosby were somewhat more clearly focused. The school, with about 550 students and a faculty of 23, was located in the midst of a white, middle-class community. The district lines, however, were so drawn that the school's catchment area included an adjacent area that was becoming increasingly Black. The proportion of Black students in the school had been growing steadily, having reached 70% when the Team entered the picture. This percentage is commonly believed to be at the tipping point, that is, the point at which virtually all White parents leave the school and the neighborhood. Among the Crosby parents, the fate of the school was perceived to be closely linked to the fate of the neighborhood, even though the

racial composition of the school did not reflect the population of the district. A large proportion of the eligible White students were already attending parochial schools.

A group of Crosby parents had decided to stand fast and fight to preserve the character of their community. The area had been designated a National Historic District, and there was considerable local pride to draw upon. The parents who joined together to stabilize the racial composition of the school were predominantly White, though both Black and White parents maintained that they preferred a racially mixed school for their children.

The group, varying in size from about 15 to 60 parents depending on the intensity of the political activities, began to put pressure on the district administration to take some action that would bring about racial stabilization at Crosby. During the two years prior to the Team's entry they submitted no fewer than seven separate proposals to the district, all of which were designed to improve the school and stop the departure of White students. The proposals ranged from a plan to ease the crowding of the school by purchasing a nearby lot for additional buildings to plans for the development of exemplary academic programs. The most controversial (and perhaps most effective) proposal would have clustered five schools in the area, each offering a distinct but desirable option to the community at large.

The administration was slow to come to Crosby's aid. It began to respond only after the parents took their case "downtown" to the Board of Education. The cluster plan was considered but found to be unworkable, since the other schools in the area, racially more stable and less troubled, found Crosby unacceptable as a member of a cluster. The Crosby parents then redoubled their efforts to upgrade the school. They contacted the central administrator in charge of innovative program development, someone who knew of the Team, and he was instrumental in arranging their entry to Crosby. In the summer of 1976, the Team was invited to a meeting with the principals of Appleton and Crosby. The principal of Crosby later made a strong request for the Team. Soon thereafter, a period of intense negotiations started concerning the conditions of the Team's work at Crosby. Interestingly enough, from this point on the parent group was excluded from the negotiations. This came to be a source of resentment against the

administration, but the parents all seemed to favor the presence of the Team and had high hopes for their intervention.

The Team's approach in negotiations with the district administration was a demanding one, and it proved highly successful. They held out for an impressive package of district resources to go along with their own services to Crosby, which, since they were still underwritten by the Ford Foundation, could be offered free of charge. Four members of the district staff were assigned to work with the Team for one day a week, four substitute days a week were provided to enable teachers to attend weekly workshops, \$3,500 was allotted for the purchase of materials, and work space was made available to the Team in the district offices. The expanded "Team" met once per week with the Principal. The value of these resources to the Team was enhanced considerably by the support it symbolized on the part of the superintendent.

An unexpected benefit was the presence of an interim principal at Crosby, the regular principal having taken a year's leave. The acting principal, an energetic, purposeful woman on her first, trial assignment as principal, was generally sympathetic to the Team's goals, but perhaps more important for the Team, she saw a link between the success of the Team and her own success in the school.

The Team's Work With Teachers

The Team spent one day a week in the Crosby School. Their main commitment was to conduct workshops — led jointly by Team members and district staff — and then provide individual follow-up in the classrooms. Substitutes were hired so that teachers were free to attend the workshops. Eighteen teachers, including elementary teachers with self-contained classrooms and intermediate grade teachers with a departmental program, participated in the program.

By prior arrangement, the program was implemented on a ten-week basis with procedures for extension based on a joint review of the experience. A satisfactory judgment of the program by the teachers, district office staff, and the Team led to a second contract for six more weeks of work, which brought the program to the end of the school year.

As part of the negotiations leading to the Team's entry into Crosby, a needs assessment was conducted of teacher priorities. During the first ten-week period, workshop offerings emphasized experiential learning, art in the curriculum, development of learning centers and reorganization of classroom space. Similar themes prevailed during the extension period — arts in the curriculum, experiential approaches to reading, a Living Things Science curriculum, and carpentry project. One departure from previous themes was a workshop on "Life Skills", which introduced teachers to materials designed by district staff to prepare eighth graders for a life skills test required by the school system. The curriculum consisted of exercises such as filling out a job application, figuring out a grocery bill and writing out checks.

Teacher views of the program, ascertained in individual

and group interviews, were highly favorable.¹

Almost every teacher in the school participated in one or more of the workshops regularly and felt he or she had gotten something valuable out of the experience. Typical comments were: "I feel it has broadened me. I'm more open and aware of what can be done." "Personally it was satisfying. The workshops had an interacting effect — people talked about various ideas. We had time to discuss values, techniques and procedures." "The workshops supported being innovative. There was already a kernel in me to move in this direction, but it became clarified."

The workshop leaders were perceived as knowledgeable resource people who had new ideas and materials. The consensus was that the leaders treated the teachers like professionals and that they did not impose ideas on the teachers but got them to participate in "brainstorming."

The impact of the workshops on the classrooms ranged from a new storage unit and rearrangement of desks ("The room feels better — you don't get claustrophobic") to the introduction of math and science learning centers and related units on plants and meal worms. Although no teacher could be said to be implementing an "open" classroom, the teachers incorporated many specific activities into their traditional classrooms. In one class the discovery of a bird's nest led to a study unit on birds which emphasized art activities. Children sketched birds, learned the parts of birds and read books on birds. This teacher was "overwhelmed" by the interest her children showed in this project. Another teacher credits the workshops with helping her "get through" to two non-readers. The breakthrough came when she let her non-readers choose which words they wanted to learn — an idea which emerged in the reading workshop. A number of teachers were especially satisfied with the help they received in follow-up activities with workshop leaders, activities that took place in their own classroom. Some teachers felt that this was what made the experience worthwhile and that more time should be devoted to individual consultation.

There were also some disappointments and frustrations voiced about the program. Several teachers felt that their goal to learn how to individualize instruction had not been fulfilled. Another felt that the carpentry workshop was overcrowded and met for too short a time. A teacher who participated in the reading workshop felt that she didn't learn anything new. A few teachers complained that the follow-up activities were minimal or irrelevant. The dissatisfaction and disappointments were, however, a minor theme in the overall picture. The only negative comments that occurred with some regularity were complaints about the disruptiveness of the release-time design to the usual functioning of their classrooms. One teacher characterized the workshop days as "mayhem" days. According to the regular teachers, the substitute teachers only "babysat" and

¹ Teachers were interviewed individually in the spring of 1977. A group interview was held in January 1978 — six months after the Team's departure.

the children were out of control when the teachers returned.

Improvement in teacher relationships was also cited as an outcome of the program. One teacher said that the workshops helped teachers to get to know one another and to feel closer professionally. Several activities involving teacher sharing grew out of the workshops. One was the establishment of an English Committee by intermediate grade teachers who had a new interest in working together. Another was the implementation of a mini-course program for seventh and eighth grade students. The program offers students choices among activities such as Black Studies, chorus, art or drama during a two-hour period each week.

Teachers also reported that relationships with district staff improved, resulting in an increase in the use of district resources. The teachers felt that the contact with district personnel in the workshops made them seem more like "real people." Several teachers signed up for summer in-service courses offered by the district office because of their experience in the workshops.

The Team viewed the program at Crosby as highly successful. In their view, it provided each teacher with substantive and useful "additions" to the curriculum and generated a taste for new kinds of teaching and learning. The Team felt that the needs assessment and contract negotiation strategies were critical features of their success. These strategies were seen as increasing teacher "ownership" of the project and resulting in more widespread teacher involvement.

The Team's enthusiasm for the Crosby project is especially understandable in light of their experiences at Appleton. Their work at Crosby was based on "lessons learned" at Appleton; and general satisfaction with the results was felt not only by Team members but also by Crosby teachers. However, this "successful" program also had its problems and limitations. The entry at Crosby was characterized by some teachers as a "difficult start" and despite the contract negotiations, there was still confusion. One teacher remarked, "We were open and receptive, but we didn't know what we were getting into."

The Team's needs assessment also received some criticism. At least one teacher felt that the workshops were based more on the Team's talents than on the teachers' needs. As Team members moved to incorporate workshop themes in response to teachers' perceived needs, they confronted the problem that such "needs" may be contradictory to their own values. This was true of the Life Skills workshop, which featured ditto sheet exercises rather than teacher-generated curriculum characterized by experiential learning. (The workshop was organized and conducted by a district staff member, backed up by a member of the Team.) Thus, the needs assessment and contract negotiation strategy employed by the Team may have increased teacher ownership of the project but simultaneously militated against radical departures from the status quo. It may have secured widespread teacher involvement, but that involvement was considerably less intense than at Appleton. No teacher at Crosby said the Team had been a "lifesaver." Nor, when asked, were the Crosby teachers sorry the Team was no longer in the school, as had been the teachers at Appleton.

While widely praised as a positive influence in the school, the Team's intervention evidently created pressures on the teachers. As one teacher said, "They made a significant contribution, but I'm relieved they're not here this year."

Finally, the Team's assessment of the success of the Crosby project must be seen in the light of their changed expectations for teacher growth. Although they did not abandon their original long-range goals for the classroom, they defined their objectives at Crosby in terms of short-range "additions to the curriculum". The inclusion of new types of activities that fit within the framework of the traditional classroom was now viewed as a stage in teacher development. This was, in fact, the level of change achieved at Crosby. For example, one teacher set up a math learning center, stocked with manipulatives that she had never used before. However, she viewed these activities as "enrichment" and continued, unchanged, her usual teacher-directed small group instruction sessions in math. At the end of the project Crosby could still be characterized, on the whole, as a place where a traditional approach to schooling prevailed.

The Work With Parents

The group of parents active in school affairs at Crosby directed their energies into political action designed to affect district policies toward the school. Day-to-day operations of the school, however, benefited little from parent contributions. There was no tradition at Crosby of service-oriented parent participation. The needs assessment undertaken by the Team revealed that a number of Crosby teachers would have welcomed parent support, and the contract drawn up between the school and the Team made increased parent involvement one of their three major goals:

To develop a large-scale parent-resource network that would provide services to the teaching staff, such as tutoring, making classroom materials, teaching special skills to groups of children, and general classroom assistance.

Omar Lopez had the major responsibility for achieving this goal, and although the various factions were consolidated it proved difficult to transform politically active parents into service-oriented parents. The eleven-person committee that was formed to work with Lopez and a district staff member saw themselves as planners and movers but would not themselves undertake the supportive activities they urged on others.

The committee did succeed in mobilizing a small group of parents to work on a variety of projects during the Team's first ten-week contract. These parents, less than a dozen, did not have a history of school participation, even though some of them had children in the school for several years. They perceived themselves as a separate group from the parents on the committee, and there was little overlap of activities between the two groups. When interviewed, the "helping" parents expressed considerable satisfaction in having a function to perform in the school. For some, this seemed the first time that they had had an opportunity to

play a role inside the school.

On our final visit to Crosby only the politically active parents made themselves available for interviews. They were in a dispirited state. One of the most influential members was moving, and hopes of achieving the racial stabilization of the school population appeared to be fading. From second-hand accounts we had the impression that the other group of parents had not fashioned themselves into a stable, dependable force. It should be repeated that these outcomes were the result of strong currents within the whole society and that a one-day-per-week intervention by teacher-advisors and one parent-community worker was unlikely to change the course of events.

District and School Administration

The district administration had arranged to cluster some schools or at least bring segments of schools together for particular programs. By January 1978, however, no one seemed optimistic that similar ways would be found to reduce the unusually high percentage of Black and "remedial" children at Crosby. The parents may have seen the intervention of the Team as one way of stemming the tide, but no one in the administration shared that hope. Several of the administrators stated that to judge the work of the Team against that criterion would mean an unfair judgment of failure.

Although involvement with the Team was time-consuming, district staff who worked with them found it an enjoyable experience. The principal of the school appreciated having district administrators more involved with classroom teachers and classroom activities. The district superintendent praised the work of the Team and their skill.

After the regular principal returned from sabbatical leave, he reported seeing results of some of the Team's work. Some teachers had arranged their rooms differently. Teachers were more active and participated more during meetings. The mini-course on Fridays for upper grade students was mentioned. A few teachers complained to him about the disruptions associated with the work of the Team, so he was not sure that the teachers would want the same kind of involvement if the Team were to come back to the school. There was no doubt in his mind, however, that the intervention had been a positive event.

A Larger Perspective

6

The experience, perspectives, and interests of readers will doubtless influence the conclusions they draw from the events we have described and interpreted here. Our own observations as evaluators are made throughout the report and summed up in the Executive Summary. Although we realize the perils of generalizing from a single case study, however elaborate, our observations generally agree with what others in similar circumstances have said. In this section we try to place some summary comments in a broader perspective.

1. *Powerful social forces, arising largely from class and other social differences, overwhelmed the innovation effort.* Recent writings have emphasized that the larger social environment often determines what occurs in the innovation process. Innovation has therefore been increasingly interpreted within the context of larger social change (House, 1977; Levin, 1977). Social forces impinge on the school in the form of community and parent pressure, district and board policies and mandates. These local forces are in turn frequently impelled by more sweeping social movements that are nationwide in scope.

The Appleton experience is certainly a case in point. The original attempt to replace the principal, the bilingual crisis, and the plan to desegregate the faculty all arose from interest group politics traceable to ethnic and class differences. Even the "continuous progress" program was stimulated by concern and legislation about handicapped children. These factors (desegregation is an obvious example) can themselves be related to broad currents running through the larger society.

2. *Factions and interest groups heavily influence both the process and effect of innovation.* Much innovative effort can be understood as factions contending with each other (House, 1974). The innovations attempted at Appleton and Crosby were stimulated by political motives and implemented in a highly politicized situation, involving groups divided along class and ethnic lines. The goals and activities of the parent and community groups, and the fate of the bilingual program, both illustrate political forces at work.

Recent studies that regard innovation as based in interest-group politics have examined some of the conditions influencing the course of innovations. The

Rand group — Greenwood, Moss, and McLaughlin (1975) — have reported that government programs designed by outsiders fail to gain support, and that outside consultants are not effective. The "lighthouse effect" of change projects has proved to be miniscule. The Rand group also found that if innovations are to take hold, strong administrative support is essential. In varying degrees, all these findings were confirmed in this project.

3. *The work structure of the school and profession constrained teacher behavior.* Lortie (1975) has shown that the teacher recruiting process, socialization pattern, and work structure make teaching a conservative occupation. Its hallmarks are individualism and isolation in the classroom. That these characteristics are deeply embedded in the work structure seems evident from the failure of the Team to create a more collegial atmosphere at Appleton, despite their strenuous efforts to do so. The Team did not try to alter the basic work structure — the individual teacher in the self-contained classroom. Had they done so, perhaps through such organizational arrangements as team teaching, they might have achieved more sharing and openness among teachers. They might have created a setting that required interdependence among teachers.

Wolcott (1977) has argued that the teacher belief system resists external change, and that teachers do not view external change forces as legitimate. The internal teacher subculture works against substantial change. This subculture, combined with the efforts of technocrats to change it, comprises a self-contained social system that appears to change but does not.

4. *The voluntaristic, psychological approach of the Team to changing the culture of the school was ineffective against the traditional work structure and impinging social forces.* By example and support, the Team hoped to promulgate norms of trust, cooperation, and collegiality. With the exception of a few teachers, they were essentially isolated within the social structure of the school district. They lacked credibility with the teachers and power within the district. Without authority their influence was minor.

The Team's most successful tactics were the establishment of the Teachers Planning Council, the Parent Support Group, and the contractual relationship with the teachers at Crosby. Each of these was a structural change in the

authority system. It is becoming increasingly clear that psychological approaches that do not deal with larger sociological realities will likely fail.

5. *Only the line authority structure within the school district had the power to effect substantial change. The principal's role was critical.* Evidence continues to accumulate that the principal, particularly in an elementary school, is absolutely critical for successful change efforts (Wolcott, 1973). Initially, the Team thought it would be sufficient that the principal remain neutral toward the innovation. They came to realize that the principal's strong support was critical. They never obtained it at Appleton; at Crosby, part of their success resulted from the support of a new principal who saw the change effort as in her interests.

Generally, in spite of inefficiency and ineffectiveness, much power and authority reside in the bureaucratic hierarchy of the school district. It is difficult for innovations to succeed without official endorsement and active support at both school and district levels (House, 1974).

6. *The ultimate result was that more change occurred in the Team's ideas of how innovations are best introduced than in the school itself.*

In their manual, *From the Roots Up*, the Team documented their changes in theoretical approach and reconsideration of strategies for implementing change. They revised some of their conceptions significantly, and retained others close to the original formulations. The Team continued to see its mission as making learning more meaningful for both teachers and children. They sought more involvement, expressiveness and self-direction for children, but placed less emphasis on teachers' partnership with their pupils.

The Team felt it succeeded when it addressed the "deep felt" concerns of teachers, and failed when it imposed Team members' own concerns. While mindful of the concerns of teachers, the Team believed it was important for them to "develop capacities and understandings" in curriculum, use of physical space, classroom organization and interpersonal relations. The Team evolved a developmental conception of teacher growth, centering on the personal relationship of advisor and teacher. The teacher started with a small change in one of the four areas, usually a rearrangement of the physical space. This served as the lever for gradually working through stages of the advisor-teacher relationship (contact, building a partnership, living the partnership, continuation), which in turn allowed for changes in organizational and interpersonal relations. The Team originally believed that openness would lead to more openness, without a set of gradual stages.

As the Rand group (1975) found with other innovators, the Team had to renegotiate its original agreements or plans for innovation. In this particular case, the renegotiation entailed fairly profound changes in the Team's own outlook on school innovation processes.

Contrasting Strategies

At Crosby the Team felt it was much more successful than

at Appleton because Crosby accepted school "ownership" of the project, the principal was active and supportive, and the district superintendent participated in it. In contrast to their procedure at Appleton, the Team specified clear goals and expectations in order to avoid misunderstandings. They negotiated short-term contracts with the Crosby teachers establishing highly specific goals, objectives, resources, and responsibilities.

In summarizing their change strategy, the Team asserted that the changes must be "personally meaningful" to the school and community, there must be change in the four interdependent areas, there must be personalized assistance from an advisor in the classroom, and parent support should be based on direct service to the classroom. Furthermore, there must be organizational development to assure support from both school and district.

Two Models of School Improvement

The Team embodied their revised conception of change in two suggested models of school improvement. In the "general district development" model, the district superintendent "communicates" to the schools that "he would like" each school to embark on an improvement project based on the school's own goals and priorities. A facilitation team then helps the school. In the "option cluster" model, the district superintendent again provides the initial impetus, but the schools work in clusters and narrow the number of options to a few. Each school in the cluster eventually selects one. In both models the initiative comes from the district superintendent and school board, and passes to the school and community.

Recognition of the importance of formal administrative initiative was a significant revision in the Team's concept of school improvement. In the original proposal, change evolved from the teacher's goals and personality, spreading outward into the school and district. In the revised theory the district superintendent makes it known that he or she expects teachers and principals to begin and carry out professional development projects but does not specify which ones. The details are left to local initiative (assisted by a facilitation team, perhaps). Support from the principal and superintendent, rather than something to be achieved, is to be obtained at the beginning and is seen as necessary for any progress. The Team's revised concept placed more emphasis on a careful needs assessment, regularly revised in light of experience. Dialogue resource centers, and teacher centers take their place alongside workshops and individual consultation, rather than being seen as the primary vehicles for bringing about change.

A Final Comment

By the end of the project, the Team had good reasons for questioning many of its strategies for change. Few teachers developed through their own goals and needs. Most did not accept the children as learning partners. Factionalism and isolation among teachers remained. Dialogue between teachers and administrators did not change unsupportive into supportive administrators. The school district did not

welcome the school's new ideas, even when put forward by Appleton teachers. The school could not be completely responsive to the community since it consisted of factions wanting diverse and occasionally incompatible things. The quality and quantity of parent participation increased during the project, but the structures that might sustain these gains were not evident.

To a position based on the "needs, purposes, and interests" of the teachers, the Team added a dimension in which pressure, albeit subtle, was applied to teachers by superintendent, principal, and parents. The contractual strategy employed at Crosby, with strong endorsement

by principal and superintendent, emphasized external pressures much more than the strategy of personal growth through dialogue that marked the beginning of the project.

The Team left good feelings behind them wherever they went, not a universal achievement of change agents. A few teachers felt their professional lives had been profoundly changed for the better, and others will not lightly give up the participation in decision-making brought about through the TPC. The Team's extended test of a dialogue model makes a unique contribution to the literature on school change.

Some Reference Points in the Chronology of the Facilitation Team

- | | | |
|------|-----------|---|
| 1971 | September | Scheinfeld, Hazell and Cichon work together as teacher advisors in two City schools. They were exploring ways to provide in-school staff development opportunities for elementary school teachers, with an emphasis on processes associated with open education. |
| 1973 | March | The three look for a school to work in, feeling that to be successful, staff development has to involve the whole school.

Appleton school parents invite the three to conduct a workshop for Appleton faculty.

Negotiations carried on with Appleton teachers, administration, school board officials and community leaders. A proposal is written and revised in consultation with the teachers. All teachers but one sign the proposal. |
| 1974 | February | Proposal submitted to the Ford Foundation.

Planning grant awarded by Ford Foundation, including support for Scheinfeld, Hazell and Cichon to visit a number of sites across the USA where a variety of staff development processes were being explored. |
| | April | Proposal revised to incorporate ideas gained from visits. Others recruited to the Team. |
| | Summer | Several workshops with Appleton teachers. |
| | September | Team begins work at Appleton. |
| 1975 | February | Ford Foundation awards grant for project to operate until June 1977.

Parent/community worker joins the staff to complete the Team. |
| | Summer | End of first full year of work. |

1976	March	Reassessment of approach to teachers and Team leadership. Visit of consultants.
	May	Scheinfeld becomes the leader of the Team. Team and Appleton teachers present their ideas and accomplishments at a meeting attended by principals and teachers from 10 neighboring schools (the 'Charette'). Cichon develops opportunities for expanding work to other schools – five possibilities identified.
	July	Crosby Principal and District Superintendent request Team to come to Crosby. End of second full year of work.
	Fall	All five schools studied. Negotiations with administration conducted.
	December	Crosby selected.
1977	January	Beginning of 16-week period of work at Crosby – one day per week plus other visits. Work with individual teachers continues at Appleton.
	June	End of project.